

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'THE Christian Faith has had to justify itself to different ages in different ways.'

The Bishop of Southwark has made this discovery. He has made it as a preacher, not as a professional apologist. He has set it down at the beginning of the Preface to a small volume of sermons, of which the title is *The Fulness of Christ* (Macmillan; 1s. 6d. net). For if the Christian faith has had to justify itself to different ages in different ways, it has to justify itself in some particular way to the present age, and the justification is the business of the ordinary preacher of the gospel.

The Christian faith justified itself to the early centuries, says Dr. Talbot, 'by the evidence of its response to the hopes and intimations of the Jewish Scriptures, and by the joy and constancy in suffering which it was able to create.' In the days of the decline and fall of the Empire, it justified itself by its power to curb and to civilize. In the eighteenth century it justified itself by its abstract moral and religious value. The demand to justify itself to our time is greater, says Bishop Talbot, than any demand that ever was made upon it. It is vital that we should know how to make it meet that demand.

Dr. Talbot sees a strong resemblance between

the condition of things in the Imperial period when the Faith first made its way and the condition of things in that period in which we are now living. Rome had demolished the local centres of force and tradition. It had attracted men of many sorts, religions, and habits to a focus in the City. And it had produced a fusion and mixture in which what was peculiar tended to vanish, and what was universal to emerge. This compelled men to grasp at ideas of what was natural and universally human. The Stoics personified Nature, and almost deified it. And lawyers as well as philosophers tried to find expression for their new conceptions of a cosmic commonwealth of gods and men.

Then Christianity came. It came in entire independence and along a road that was all its own. But it came as a universal religion. And it was found to be congenial—Dr. Talbot says providentially congenial—to the temper of its time, as it would not have been congenial if it had appeared in the time of the Roman Republic or of the Greek autonomies.

The situation in our day is kindred in character. It is kindred in character but far wider in range. In place of the Mediterranean area, we have (approximately) the whole face of the globe. For the Pax Romana we have a period of general

peace. For the network of Roman roads we have steam and electricity and universal travel. 'In the world of action and in the world of thought everything touches everything, and all become aware of the things of each other. Religious systems and national customs are each other's critics. What is peculiar, local, and partial attracts indeed any amount of curious interest and study; but it tends to disappear, or at least we see what is universal undermining and transforming it. The tendencies of the time point to and require that which is of universal scope, and especially that which is simply, broadly, and comprehensively human.'

That is the demand. Is the Christian religion, is the gospel of Jesus Christ, fit to meet it? In its origin it belongs to a particular period of the history of the world, and a period that is long past. It had to clothe itself in the languages of Greece and Rome. Though it sprang from a Semitic people, and from a land more Oriental than Western, it has been the religion mainly of Europe and the West. Is it then really a local and ephemeral thing? And is it to be swallowed up along with other ephemeral things in that fusion of cults which is to bring about the universal religion of the future?

The Bishop of Southwark does not think so. Of course he does not. But he sees very clearly that it is the duty of the believer in Christ not only to be ready to give an account to every man of the hope that is in him, but to see to it that the account which he gives is one that will meet the necessities of this very time.

In the history of God's dealings with the people of Israel it is a strange place that is occupied by the Gibeonites. The story of how they 'did work wilily, and went and made as if they had been ambassadors,' completely outwitting the princes of the congregation of Israel, is told with almost humorous simplicity in the Book of Joshua (9³⁻²⁷).

And on the whole our sympathy is with them. But when they are mentioned again, the situation is changed. The narrative is not so simple. The incident is at the furthest remove from humour. And our sympathy is divided very perplexingly.

They are mentioned again in the lifetime of David. 'There was a famine in the days of David, three years, year after year. And David inquired of the Lord. And the Lord answered, It is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites' (2 S 21¹). There is no record of this slaughter in the history of Saul. We know nothing about the occasion of it, and its motive is difficult to understand. It is simply stated that 'Saul sought to slay them in his zeal for the children of Israel and Judah' (2 S 21²). But the perplexity is greatly deepened when we read that, to avenge their wrong, the Gibeonites demanded, and David granted them, seven men of Saul's family that they might 'hang them up unto the Lord' (21⁶).

Our sympathy begins at once to depart from the Gibeonites when we read this. They may have been cruelly and even treacherously dealt with by Saul. But they are taking a cruel revenge. If Saul did them wrong, they seem to be returning wrong to the sons of Saul. Our sympathy passes to the seven young men and their mothers. And when the historian proceeds to tell the story of Rizpah, we can scarcely abstain from emphatic denunciation of the whole proceeding.

But we cannot help seeing that our righteous indignation has no encouragement in the narrative of the Bible. It is there distinctly stated that the seven men were hung up 'unto the Lord,' and that after their bleached bones were gathered and buried, 'God was entreated for the land.'

Here therefore is a portion of the Word of God which it is very difficult to use for edification. It has its fascination. Tennyson's 'Rizpah' is the literary artist's response to the universal appeal it

makes. But we cannot preach about it. Professor W. G. Jordan tells us that one day recently in a Conference of ministers he endeavoured to discover how often the story of Rizpah was taken as a text. There were young preachers at the Conference, and there were preachers who had had long and varied experience. But none of them had ever preached on Rizpah.

It was not always so. There was a time when this narrative, like every other narrative in the Bible, could be used for homiletical purposes without a quiver. Being in the Bible, it must be meant for edification. And if the edification was not evident on the face of it, a little ingenuity could always adapt it. Professor Jordan takes Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, as it was published in 1863, as representative of what 'the old-fashioned apologetic could do with such awkward material.'

The article is on the Books of Samuel. First of all the story is admitted to be a 'horrible' one. For this Dictionary was a little before its time, and even then inclined to yield something to the demands of human nature. But the author is convinced that 'God did not command this,' though he has no explanation to offer of words like 'the Lord answered,' 'and God was entreated for the land.' Finally, it is suggested that the whole transaction was due to political motives. David availed himself of this religious pretext in order to remove from his path those dangerous 'sons' of Saul.

No such article could be written now. How different is the article which Professor W. G. Jordan contributes to the *Biblical World* for January 1909. He does not call the story horrible. It has a sad pathos, he says, a tragic interest; but to call it horrible is to obliterate time. It is futile also to say that God did not command the deed to be done. And that David was moved by a mere political motive is to save the situation at the expense of David's character. 'We can no longer regard David as the kind of

saint that he was pictured to be by the later ages. He was not a saint of the Jewish and mediæval type. He did not spend all his time in composing psalms and conducting Church festivals. But we have too much admiration for the real David to believe him capable of anything so devilish as this.'

Is there, then, nothing that can be done with the story of Rizpah? These things were written aforetime for our edification; is this incident, almost thrust into the artist's hand, beyond the possibility of treatment by the preacher? Professor Jordan has written his article for the very purpose of recapturing it for the pulpit.

The story stands by itself. It is a separate fragment, preserved among the records of the life of David, but without any place in their chronological order. If that is not evident on the face of it, the application of the rules of criticism will bring it out. These rules and their application do not belong to the pulpit. They belong to the study. The pulpit enjoys the result of them. And the result of them is that the story has its place in the early days of the history of Israel. Its exact date does not need to be mentioned or even ascertained. Its authenticity is of no account. For modern homiletical use the attention may therefore be given wholly to the ideas which the narrative contains. It is certainly of the utmost importance that its ideas should be regarded in their setting. Without that regard the older exegesis went astray. That is the secret of all the success which the newer method obtains. But it is enough that the story belongs to the time of David. A more exact determination of date or circumstance is unnecessary in order that its theology may be understood and applied. And the theology is the thing. It is for the sake of its theology that the Bible was written.

Now the first thing which comes clearly out of this narrative of the Gibeonites' vengeance is a

certain theological conception of nature. There is a famine in the land. It is the cause of great distress. In accordance with the view of nature which prevailed, the famine is traced to the direct action of God. He has sent it as a punishment for some definite offence that has been committed.

Professor Jordan calls this theology primitive. He admits that it still exists, and that it is still preached from some of our pulpits. For it is a portion of that rigid system of theology in which some of the preachers of to-day were trained. But it is a mistake to preach it to-day.

In the middle of last century Christian teachers and men of science proclaimed that such visitations as cholera and typhoid were tokens of the anger of God. They did well. But why was God angry? Because of the neglect of those laws of cleanliness which He has impressed upon His world. They did well to propitiate God by prayer and sacrifice. They did well also to attend to their drains.

That is the first thing. It is a lesson most suitable for pulpit use, most edifying. In the universe of God, God Himself does all things decently and in order, and we must do all things decently and in order. And commonplace as it may seem to be, when it is apprehended and applied it records a complete revolution in the thoughts of men concerning the ways of God. Should famine or earthquake befall a nation now, we are to believe that it is due to the hand of God, as our fathers did, but not that it is sent as punishment for a sin with which it has no connexion. The massacre of the Gibeonites will find its own reward. The famine is due perhaps to the selfish neglect of forethought for the poor; the earthquake perhaps to criminal carelessness in the choice of a place to live in or the use of materials to build with.

This is not to contradict the Bible. It is to

interpret it. For we have been enabled to see that the truths of the Bible are true for all time, but that they need interpretation. To interpret David's idea of natural events to our time is to strip it of those imperfections which necessarily cling to every attempt at explaining phenomena in a pre-scientific age. To David, and probably even to Rizpah, there was no degradation of God in associating Him with an act of atonement like this. The appearance of degradation is due to our notions of the 'timelessness' of Scripture, about which, as Dr. Jordan says, we occasionally hear much brilliant nonsense.

But there is another great truth in this story. It is the truth that God is a God of justice. Separate the idea again from the form in which it happens to appear, and you see that this idea of justice is a lofty one. It is the idea that God, the God of Israel, demands the fulfilment of a promise made by Israel to an alien. A vow is binding always, and not merely so long as it is politically expedient to observe it. Faithfulness is universal; it is not limited by sect or nation. It is one of those great prophetic truths, says Dr. Jordan, for which we are indebted to the Hebrew race. The circumstances may seem unfamiliar to us. But however uncouth the frame, this story of revenge for Saul's disregard of the promise made to the Gibeonites is in pictorial form the great thought, so clearly taught by Amos, that the God of Israel values righteousness more than He values Israel's political life.

And there is yet another truth. It is the truth, true for all time, that a mother's love is quenchless. We feel for Rizpah. Probably we feel for her most where she herself felt the cross she carried least. We lament the cruel injustice that took her sons from her to avenge another's wrong. She probably acquiesced in that. She was a secondary wife, a piece of Saul's property; she had few rights and few possessions. She could not call her sons her own, though she could consume in grief for the loss of them. What she did feel probably was that

they had not been buried. And when David heard of her long sad vigil, and came and buried the bodies, Rizpah went home in peace.

It has been suggested (chiefly, we think, by Dr. Schechter, formerly Professor of Hebrew in University College, London, now President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America) that the picture of the Pharisees in the Gospels is an exaggeration, and that even our Lord is represented as a little unfair to them.

It may be so. That is to say, it may be that the impression which the behaviour of the Pharisees in the Gospels makes upon us now, is more unfavourable than it should be. For the Gospels give no complete history of any of the sects mentioned in them. They are made up of selected incidents. More than that, when we have once obtained our unfavourable estimate of the Pharisees, we are apt to forget their better examples, and let our minds rest upon the worse. Nevertheless, it is not a matter of very great consequence. It is not denied that there is much that is unlovely in the Pharisaic character as it is presented in Judaism itself. The Christian spirit is a spirit of fairness. And it will be satisfied by receiving the hint to keep in mind in the future the fact that the rich young ruler, Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, and Gamaliel were Pharisees.

But when the charge is made that St. Paul deliberately misrepresented the Jewish feeling for the Law, that is a different matter. Should the Pharisees be made to recover a little of their lost estimation, there is no good Christian but will rejoice. But the burden of the Law is the opportunity of the Gospel. If the average pious Israelite could keep the Law; if he did keep it, and even took great delight in keeping it, where is the opportunity for the grace of God in Christ Jesus? St. Paul says that Christ came to redeem us from the curse of the Law. How could that be if the Law was not a curse?

It is, again, Dr. Schechter who says that the Law was not a curse. It is he who says that the keeping of it was a perpetual joy. He has published another volume of essays on Judaism, calling it *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d. net). Much of the material he works with belongs to the New Testament times, some of it, as he believes, to the lifetime of St. Paul. And from first to last he has it in his mind to show that St. Paul, for his own purposes, made out the Law to be a burden when it was the very opposite of that, a daily satisfaction and delight.

Dr. Schechter would not admit that he has any difficulty in proving this. But he is honest enough to begin with a statement which it takes him some time to get over. It is a statement of Rabbi Simlai, that 'six hundred and thirteen commandments were delivered unto Moses on Mount Sinai, three hundred and sixty-five of which are prohibitive laws, corresponding to the number of days of the solar year, whilst the remaining two hundred and forty-eight are affirmative injunctions, being as numerous as the limbs constituting the human body.'

This, he says, is one of the statements that have been used to show the burden under which the scrupulous Jew must have laboured. But Dr. Schechter does not believe that the numbers were meant to be taken seriously. Rabbi Simlai was writing for edification. He wished to make his congregation feel the force of two important lessons. The first was the fact that each new day brings its new temptations, which can be resisted only by a firm 'Do not.' The second was the fact that to the service of God man must give his whole being, each limb or member of his body being entrusted with the execution of its own particular office.

In proof that Rabbi Simlai did not himself take the numbers seriously, Dr. Schechter quotes the end of the sermon. It runs thus: 'David came

(after Moses), and reduced them (the six hundred and thirteen commandments) to eleven, as it is said: Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle?' 'Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly,' etc. (Ps 15²⁻⁵). Then Isaiah came, and reduced them to six, as it is said: 'He that walketh righteously,' etc. (Is 33¹⁵). Then Micah came, and reduced them to three: 'He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly,' etc. (Mic 6⁸). Then Isaiah came again, and reduced them to two, as it is said: 'Thus saith the Lord, Keep my judgments, and do justice' (Is 56¹). Then Amos came, and reduced them to one, as it is said: 'Seek the Lord, and live' (Am 5⁶). Whilst Habbakuk (also) reduced them to one, as it is said: 'But the just shall live by his faith' (Hab 2⁴).

But it is not to be forgotten that even so great an authority as Maimonides understood the number literally. Still Dr. Schechter is not to be disturbed. This proves nothing, he says, for the 'burden' theory. For by the time of Rabbi Simlai and even earlier, many of the commandments were already obsolete. They were originally addressed to local and immediate circumstances which had passed away, such as those that have to do with the furnishings of the tabernacle or the conquest of Canaan; or to particular classes and individuals, as the Nazirites, the Judges, the King, and the High Priest. And in any case, Dr. Schechter does not believe that the ancient Israelite was troubled about the keeping of the separate commandments in the Law. In his mind he distinguished the Law from the commandments which compose it, just as a Christian will separate the Church from its members. He might not keep all the commandments, but that did not prevent him from finding his delight in the Law.

But then, on the other hand, when the Israelite took delight in the Law, he took delight also in keeping such of the commandments as he could.

There is a story which comes down perhaps from the very time in which St. Paul was writing of the Law as the strength of sin. It relates to a law, which is found in Dt 24¹⁹, that a sheaf forgotten in the harvest field belonged to the poor, the owner being forbidden to go again and fetch it. This law was called 'the commandment of forgetfulness.' It was the one and only law that a man fulfilled by forgetting. For if he remembered it, he would also remember the sheaf.

This then is the story. It is found in the Tosephta. 'There was a Chasid or saint who forgot a sheaf in his field, and was thus enabled to fulfil the commandment of forgetfulness. Whereupon he bade his son go to the temple and offer for him a burnt-offering and a peace-offering, whilst he also gave a great banquet to his friends in honour of the event. Thereupon his son said to him: Father, why dost thou rejoice in this commandment more than in any other law prescribed in the Torah? He answered, that it was the occurrence of the rare opportunity of accomplishing the will of God, even as the result of some oversight, which caused him so much delight.'

And Dr. Schechter will not let us answer and say that this story is an ancient matter. He has seen the same joy in our own day. 'I myself,' he says, 'had once the good fortune to observe one of those old-type Jews, who, as the first morning of the Feast of Tabernacles drew near, used to wake and rise soon after the middle of the night. There he sat, with trembling joy, awaiting impatiently the break of dawn, when he would be able to fulfil the law of the palm branches and the willows.'

There is no man that we know of, not even Professor Sanday himself, who seems to have a more appropriate message for our day, or seems able to deliver it better, than Professor W. G. Jordan of Queen's University, Canada. Already this month we have noticed one article of his. Now let us notice another.

It is found in the *Methodist Review*, a quarterly which belongs to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; and is ably edited by Dr. Gross Alexander. The title of the article is 'Israel's Second Exodus.' But its subject is the Exodus from Houndsditch.

For Professor Jordan has no mere scholar's interest in the history of the past, not even in the past history of Israel. He is a critical student of the Old Testament, and he has come to the conclusion that 'the fact of the Exile cannot be questioned.' But much as the relief will be which that statement will bring to trembling Uzziahs, Dr. Jordan is not overwhelmed with its significance. It is to him of far more consequence that we should share with him the Exodus from Houndsditch than that we should believe Israel enjoyed an Exodus from Mesopotamia.

What is the significance of the Exodus from Mesopotamia? The Exodus from Mesopotamia turned the Jewish nation into a Jewish Church. And then it came out that the Exile had done three things for the Jew which had never been done before.

It made him a man of letters. There was writing before the Babylonian Exile, but the return from the Captivity called the Scribes into being and gave them a perpetual occupation. Since that time the Jew has taken his share in the literary and philosophical movements of the world. And his contribution to literature has worked for the general good.

It made him a missionary. Greece furnished a language that was more fitted than Hebrew to be an instrument of missionary effort, and then the synagogues of the dispersion, in spite of their narrowness and grim legalism, became centres of light for reverent God-seeking men of many nations; and in the natural order the gospel knocked first at the door of the synagogue.

It made him a trader. After the Exile the Jew

became a merchant, and Dr. Jordan has no doubt that some cynic anticipated the remark which has been made of the Scotchman, that 'he kept the ten commandments and everything else he could lay his hands upon.' But those who have denounced the Jew have often first driven him to this line of life, and then denounced him from envy of his success in it. Even on the commercial side of his life the Jew has been a servant of humanity, a minister of civilization and culture.

Thus the Exodus from the land of the willow trees was a blessing to Israel and to mankind. But how much greater would the blessing be if the Exodus could take place from Houndsditch. It is Carlyle that speaks of the Exodus from Houndsditch. Why did he not become its leader?

The time was not ripe. First there had to come the scientific study of the ancient religion and of the Old Testament, 'in so far as such study is the servant of devout, reverent faith.' For in the new Exodus men must be one with the past in its faith, its hope, its love; but separate from it in respect of its local form and colour. The new Exodus must be separate in respect of the things that can be shaken, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain with it.

The time was not ripe. That was one thing. And Carlyle was not ready. That was another. He had not faith enough. He was still in the captivity. He looked up to the silent stars and said, 'He does nothing.' And he despised the present in the light which his imagination threw on the past. The past was peopled with heroes; the present was occupied by creatures whose misery well matched their meanness.

Carlyle could not lead the Exodus out of Houndsditch, much as he longed that the Exodus would take place. 'If we were well out of Houndsditch,' he said, 'bringing our own with us.' What a pathos there is in the words.

'Bringing our own with us'? Surely. Let us leave nothing behind that is our own. If our heart goes out, let our head go also. And the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—He also is ours. But let Him go out

with us not exactly and only as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for that would be no Exodus from Houndsditch, but as the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The Religious-Historical Movement in German Theology.

BY THE REV. J. M. SHAW, M.A., EDINBURGH.

I.

FOR the understanding of the present religious-historical movement in Germany we must start with Albrecht Ritschl, the pivotal figure of later nineteenth-century theology. In his early days an enthusiastic disciple of Hegel and Baur, he yet came to feel that the speculative construction of Christianity offered by the method of the Hegelian dialectic failed to do justice to the facts of Christian faith and history. The Hegelian interpretation of the significance of Jesus Christ in particular offended his feeling for historical reality; and so, guided by a new theological method, Ritschl made a determined attempt to re-establish for faith the absolute value of the personality of the historic Jesus. Of this new method the two essential principles were—(1) that religious knowledge is to be distinguished from scientific and philosophical knowledge as practical from theoretical—as knowledge, that is to say, essentially relative to faith, consisting in 'judgments of value' or 'worth' (*Werturteile*), which are not so much to be theoretically proved as practically experienced; and (2) that the source and norm of this practical or faith-knowledge is to be found in the Divine Revelation given in the fact of the historic Jesus, as this fact is represented and interpreted in the believing witness of the New Testament.

In the working out of a system, however, on the basis of these principles, Ritschl, and, after him, his followers of the Right—especially Kaftan—betrayed the weakness that is apt to attend on all reactions. In the tendency, on the one hand, to isolate the revelation of God given in Jesus

Christ as a fact *sui generis*, altogether different from anything that might be called revelation elsewhere; and, on the other, to insulate the Christian faith based on this revelation, so making it less or more independent of, or indifferent to, the results of scientific, historical, or philosophical criticism,—Ritschlianism, in the enthusiasm of its opposition to the Hegelian construction, was in danger of losing sight of the great truth for which Hegelianism with all its one-sidedness stood; and in so far it set itself against the main trend of the thinking of the time. This was the thoroughgoing application to every department of knowledge of the category of evolution which bids us see everywhere not sudden inbreaks of creative power, but continuous progressive change from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher, by means of an immanent power working according to certain observable laws. Fruitful in the world of nature this scientific conception became increasingly applied to the sphere of history, converting an atomistic into an organic view of things; until in the latter half of the nineteenth century, largely through the influence of Hegel and his school, its thoroughgoing application in the sphere of religion gave rise to the Comparative Science of Religion and the new understanding of religious history which this has brought about. Marred in the case of the Hegelians by a too *à priori* speculative method of procedure, the comparative evolutionary study of religions received new impetus through subsequent investigations carried out in a more purely scientific spirit—investigations alike in the fields of philology, archæology, ethnology, and anthropology.

The result was a great widening of the horizon of interest in, and knowledge of, civilizations and religions outside the Christian; which in turn had the effect of suggesting considerable modifications in the old methods of regarding Christianity. A number of the younger theologians of Germany (many of them former pupils of Ritschl, who grew to be dissatisfied with the positions of their master), under the influence of the new scientific historical spirit, asked: Why should Christianity be studied as if it were something unique and apart, 'a holy island in the sea of history,' the only true supernatural religion in the midst of a religious development which throughout is the subject of uniform law? Historically, it is said, Christianity is only one of the many forms which the religious consciousness has assumed in the course of its development, just as European culture is but one of the many forms which civilization has assumed in the long history of the human race. Is it not unscientific—such was their question—to take a section of religious history, call it 'sacred,' 'supernatural,' or 'revealed,' over against all other religions which, as the product merely of men's thought or imagination, were denominated 'natural'; and in Ritschlian fashion, through an inner attestation in heart and conscience,—a 'faith-witness' or 'faith-knowledge,'—claim freedom for it from the scrutiny which historical criticism applies to other religions. Away with all presuppositions as to its peculiar or unique character—presuppositions with which for too long men have been accustomed to come to the investigation of Christianity. Let it be studied by the same method as has proved fruitful elsewhere, a method which, as defined by Troeltsch of Heidelberg,¹ consists essentially in the application of three principles—(1) the principle of *criticism* or the repudiation of all traditional authority; (2) the principle of *analogy* by which phenomena of one part of religious history are estimated by comparison with similar or analogous phenomena elsewhere; and (3) the fundamental principle, of which analogy is but an implication—the principle of the *correlativity* of phenomena, according to which all that happens in history forms one great stream, in which nothing is isolated but everything stands in mutual relation with other things, and ultimately with the whole. In its application to Christianity this method—the historical, or,

as it is usually called in Germany, to define its particular reference to the sphere of religion, the *religious-historical* method (*die religions-geschichtliche Methode*)—means the demand that the religion of Jesus Christ, including its old Testament preparation, be considered in its place in the stream of religious history, and in essential connexion with religions chronologically and geographically adjacent to it. Only so, it is said, will the true nature of Christianity as an historical religion reveal itself; only so can the superiority of Christianity to other religions, if superiority there be, be rationally established.

For an adequate or complete understanding of the nature of Christianity as an historical religion, however, one thing more is necessary. We have not only to set it in the confluence of history and observe the results deposited in the course of its progress—in the form of doctrines, cults, and Church institutions—we must trace the stream of Christianity back to its source, and observe it as it bubbles up in all its native freshness from the depth of the personal life. Harnack had already shown the importance for the proper understanding even of the doctrinal development of Christianity in any period of a living realization of the religious life and situation of the time.² The impulse thus given to the study of the religious life as such found further and fuller expression in the works of Duhm, Gunkel, Weinel, and others; and, aided by the increasing attention devoted, especially in America, to the psychology and pathology of religion, a new interest gathered round the attempt to get behind the Christianity which is formulated in creed and doctrine and institution, and psychologically reconstruct and realize the elementary religious experience of the first Christians.³ 'The first and proper object of theological science,' says Weinel,⁴ 'is religion.' Back, therefore, from the study of Christian doctrine and cult, back to the study of the inner religious life itself, of which these are but the deposits and excrescences—

² In his *History of Dogma*. Cf. what he says in the *Theol. Literat.-Zeitung*, 1899, Kol. 513: 'Eine Skizze der eigentümlichen Art des religiösen Erlebnisses und der Frömmigkeit sollte in allen Perioden die Grundlage bilden für das Verständnis der Lehrentwicklung.'

³ The self-consciousness of Jesus in particular has been made the subject of careful psychological analysis and reconstruction.

⁴ *Die Wirkungen des Geistes u. der Geister im nachapost. Zeitalter*, p. v.

¹ *Theol. Art. u. d. Rhein. wiss. Predigerverein*, 1900, p. 104 f.

back, above all, to the sympathetic realization and presentation of the primitive Christian religious experience in its free original unformulated simplicity.

The religious-historical movement, then, as the outcome of the new interest, on the one hand, in the comparative study of religions, and on the other in religious psychology, stands for a twofold demand—(1) that right be done by Christianity as an historical religion entering history at a certain time and in a certain situation, and (2) that this historic Christianity be investigated not primarily as a doctrinal or ecclesiastical system, but as religious life and experience. The theology governed by this twofold aim, and based upon or regulated by the religious-historical method as above defined, will, it is claimed, in one important respect especially, differ from previous theology. It will be scientific, non-dogmatic, an historical-psychological discipline guided not by presuppositions of Church or dogma, but solely by considerations of historical truth and reality (*Respekt vor der nackten Wirklichkeit*). Besides that of Troeltsch, the chief apologist or *Systematiker* of the movement, the best known names are those of Gunkel, Bousset, Heitmüller, Weinel, Wernle, and Wrede. These thinkers, if they cannot strictly perhaps be called a 'school,' yet all represent a common tendency or movement (*Bewegung*), viz. the introduction of the religious-historical method in the twofold sense defined into every department of theological thought and activity—exegetic, apologetic, and systematic; and a remodelling of the theological faculty on this basis.¹

II.

As applied in the sphere of *exegesis*, the claim is that the Biblical religion and theology can only be understood when seen in vital connexion with the main currents of contemporary religious thought and history, and therefore should be studied as a section of the general ancient history of religion.²

In the early 'eighties Wellhausen in Germany, and Robertson Smith here, had pointed out analogies and resemblances between the religion of

Israel, especially in its early development, and other surrounding Semitic religions. And more recent archæological research, especially in the sphere of Assyriology and Egyptology, has brought forward with a new emphasis the question of the influence on Israelitic-Jewish religion of Oriental mythology, particularly the Babylonian and Egyptian. But such questions once raised could not be confined to the Old Testament. The characteristic of the later part of the nineteenth century is the transference of the interest even of Old Testament scholars to the New Testament,³ and the application to the central writings of Christianity of critical methods which were first applied to the Old Testament preparation. With the consequent deepened realization of the syncretistic character of the age in which Christianity had its rise, the fact has been emphasized that the New Testament cannot, as Ritschl had maintained, be understood simply as the direct outcome of the Old Testament. Chiefly through Schürer's monumental work on *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*, and the subsequent researches in this field of experts like Baldensperger, Johannes Weiss, Spitta, Gunkel, and Bousset, the necessity was realized for the understanding, especially of the Gospels and the teaching and self-consciousness of Jesus, first of the study of late Judaistic extracanonical literature—particularly the Apocalyptic—and then through this of the literature of the whole contemporary religious *milieu*. Harnack, in his *History of Dogma*, had made an energetic attempt to understand the development of Christianity in the post-apostolic and ancient Catholic age by relation to the pagan environment in which it found itself,—seeing in it 'the work of the Greek spirit on the soil of the Gospel.' To this extent he was the forerunner of the more specifically religious-historical method of investigation. But under the influence of his master Ritschl, who held that the New Testament was free from the atmosphere of pagan thought, and was conditioned throughout solely by Old Testament presuppositions, Harnack had at first refrained from carrying such a method of consideration backwards to the investigation and interpretation of the beginnings of Christianity. The widening of the horizon of our knowledge of other religions, however, and a truer understanding of the variety of the influences that contributed to form the intellectual and spiritual

¹ The question of remodelling has, it would seem, fallen largely into the background. The vigorous criticism of Harnack in his *Rektoratsrede* of 1901, *Die Aufgabe d. theol. Facult. u. d. allgem. Religionsgesch.*, dealt a severe blow to the proposal.

² See the Programme of the series, *Forschungen zur Religion u. Literatur d. A. u. N. T.*, edited by Bousset and Gunkel.

³ e.g. Wellhausen and Gunkel.

environment in which Christianity arose, brought forward the question of the influence on the development even of early Christianity—the Christianity of the Apostolic Age—of religions of foreign origin (both Occidental and Oriental). In particular the study of the mythology of non-Christian religions—Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, Greek, Roman, and others—led to the attempt to understand much in the New Testament through analogies and parallels drawn from these sources. And the common attitude of the religious-historical movement in the field of New Testament exegesis may be fairly represented by the thesis of Gunkel in one of his works,¹ that ‘in its origin and shaping (*Ausbildung*), in important, even in some essential points the religion of the New Testament (through Judaism) stood under the influence of alien religions.’

This means a new interest in the question of Christian origins and antecedents, and the rise of a new genetic or embryological study of Christian conceptions. Hitherto the attention of Biblical scholars was directed primarily to textual and literary criticism—to questions of authorship, structure, composition, and date of the Biblical writings. But this, it is now held, is only a preparation for the work of historical criticism proper, viz. the investigation of the antecedents of Biblical thought and language in general religious history. This involves an immense widening of the province of Biblical exegesis and theology. The old standpoint, according to which for the Bible student there existed only the Old Testament and the New, is broken through; and the sphere of investigation enlarged to include not only Jewish extra-canonical religion and literature, but the whole religious literature of the time—Jewish and non-Jewish alike. No longer is it held to be enough for the explanation of a Biblical idea or phrase to take all the scriptural passages where it occurs, and by induction from these arrive at its general meaning. It must be investigated in the context of general religious history. The religious-historical investigation of the Biblical phrase ‘in the name of Jesus,’ for example, by Heitmüller,²

means the elucidation of its meaning and usage in the New Testament by the bringing forward of analogies in Babylonian, Persian, Mandaean, and other forms of religions and worship where the name of the Deity is thought of as itself a part of the divine essence, the mere utterance of which acts as a kind of charm. So Gunkel³ places the whole Christ-picture of the New Testament—not only the Christology of Paul and John, but the Gospel narratives of the Infancy, Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration, Resurrections and Ascension—in the wide-flowing stream of religious history, and undertakes to explain the New Testament representation of Christ by the help of mythological conceptions diffused throughout the Orient, and derived chiefly from Babylonia.

Now in the religious-historical method as applied in exegesis we have a factor the importance of which cannot be overlooked by theologians of whatever school. Biblical theology in the past has too much suffered from the violence of exegesis which was ‘dogmatic’ or unscientific in the sense that, influenced by certain ecclesiastical or doctrinal considerations (e.g. a certain theory of inspiration), it investigated the Bible to support certain modern preconceived doctrines or views; and was intent rather on finding these its own modern views in the old writings than on recognizing there views utterly strange or foreign to it. In this sense much of the Ritschlian exegesis was dogmatic. The idea, e.g. which Ritschl made the regulative principle of Christian theology—the Biblical conception of the ‘Kingdom of God’—was interpreted in the modern ethical sense; and scant justice was done to the eschatological ideas which are now known to have formed such an important part of the New Testament religious world-view. As opposed to such a procedure, religious-historical exegesis insists that the first necessity for a truly historical understanding of the Bible is the historical sense, which realizes the difference between the ancient and the modern view-points, and seeks sympathetically to realize and enter into the original, historical, and psychological situation of the writer and his correspondents. What is essential for the historical understanding of Paul’s ideas, e.g., is that ‘the interpreter should come to his words through the modes of thought and feeling belonging to Paul’s

¹ *Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis des N.T.*, p. 1. For an English statement of the position, see Cheyne’s *Bible Problems*. ‘There are parts of the N.T. which can only be accounted for by the newly discovered fact of an Oriental Syncretism which began early and continued late’ (p. 19).

² *Im Namen Jesu—eine sprach. u. religionsgesch. Untersuchung zum N.T.*, 1903.

³ *Uti supra*, pp. 64, 89–95. Cf. Pfeiderer, *The Early Christian Conception of Christ*, 1903. Pfeiderer’s whole life-work paved the way for the new movement.

own time, rather than through the fabrics of doctrine which theologians of a later day have reared upon them.¹ Only so will he find out what the author meant by his words and ideas, and what the first readers understood by them, as opposed to what subsequent ages have read into them. The result of this historical and psychological realism—the sustained endeavour to get behind formulæ of doctrine or worship to the inner realities of thought and life—has been a new impression of the genuinely historical character of the Biblical religion and literature. By investigating this religion and literature, not as a thing isolated and apart, but in intimate relation to the environment of general religious history, modern exegetical study lets us see how many ideas even in the New Testament are conditioned by, and essentially relative to, the historical circumstances and psychological atmosphere of the time. Thus many expressions and conceptions which are strange to our modern ways of thinking have become intelligible to us for the first time through religious-historical exegesis.¹ Especially is this the case in such a book as ‘the *Apocalypse of St. John*’—the New Testament book to which this style of exegesis was first applied, where the peculiar apocalyptic symbolism of the ancient world-view, which formed such a stumbling-block to the old psychological allegorical methods of interpretation, plays such a prominent part. We see the author as a genuine ancient, a man of his time breathing its mental air and sharing in large measure its psychological presuppositions. Even Jesus in His words and teaching has become for us in this sense a new historical reality.

The *danger* is that, in reaction from the earlier exegesis which too much overlooked the difference between the old and the new, the religious-historical should exaggerate the resemblance between the Biblical and other ancient religions and literature, and overlook what in the Biblical is new, original, and unique. This manifests itself in various ways—chiefly in the tendency (1) to argue from similarity of form to identity of content, (2) to translate what is at most analogy into a relation of

genealogy or dependence. The tendency ever is to lay undue emphasis on the primitive elements in Christianity, on the rudimentary ecstatic manifestations, *e.g.*, which are common to it with other religions.² But this means an insufficient appreciation of what is *new* in the religious experience of the Biblical authors and writers. Analogies, even relations of dependence, between Christianity and other religions cannot be ruled out beforehand as inconsistent with a certain preconceived view of revelation and inspiration. More harm than good is done to Christianity and Christian truth by such a procedure. The first of Christian truths, as Pascal reminds us, is that truth must be loved first of all—from whatever quarter it comes. This question of dependence is a question for the expert and the specialist to decide, and must wait on the investigation of the facts. But to trace the origin or antecedents of a Biblical conception or phrase does not in itself settle the question of the meaning or significance of this conception or phrase in the Biblical writings. Ideas not at first specifically Christian may have been taken up into the Pauline formulation; but, in being so taken up, they have entered into a new context, the context of a new religious experience, through relation to which they have become transmuted, and filled with a new, a Christian content.

Take, what Bousset³ calls ‘the foundation-pillar of religious-historical exegesis,’ the New Testament—in particular the Pauline—view of the Sacraments. The results of the investigations of Heitmüller,⁴ who, following Eichhorn, has made this his peculiar province, is that at the root of the Pauline conception he finds a physical, or quasi-physical, view of the Sacraments which is traceable to the influence of pagan mystery-conceptions. In opposition to Kähler, he maintains that the Sacrament with Paul was fundamentally a ceremony which by its mere outward performance (*ex opere operato*) secured to mankind a supernatural spiritual good independent of the personal, ethical, and religious attitude of the believer.

Now analogies or parallels there may be between the sacramental ideas of Paul and the mystery-conceptions. The Pauline ideas may even, in

¹ *e.g.* the reference to ‘baptism for the dead’ in 1 Corinthians. In the matter of language, special reference should be made to the recent researches among the Egyptian papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions—on the part of such men as Deissmann in Germany and Moulton here—which have shown that the language of the N.T. is practically the common colloquial Greek of the first century.

² So specially in Gunkel’s and Weinell’s investigations into the N.T. doctrine of the Spirit.

³ *Theol. Rundschau*, 1904, p. 315.

⁴ *Im Namen Jesu*, 1903; *Tarife u. Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 1903.

certain aspects, reflect the influence of these mystery-conceptions. That is a very doubtful supposition, yet the question is one for experts to decide. But even supposing such as earlier collocation or derivation proved, this is far from explaining their distinctively Pauline usage and content. 'Tears,' says Balzac, 'I have decomposed them, they contain a little phosphate of lime, chloride of sodium, mucin and water.' That is all the analysis of chemistry may find in them, but to God and man they are more than lime+sodium+mucin+water. They are tears; and the whole divine and human meaning of them remains after the analytical chemist has done what he can to explain them. So the antecedents, by reference to which the new exegesis seeks to explain the Pauline ideas, are not adequate to the interpretation of their proper meaning or content. That meaning is revealed only to the man who realizes as the central organizing or synthesizing principle of the apostle's thought the new experience which was his through relation to a new fact.

And the root mistake of much of what is called religious-historical exegesis is that it is guilty of a *new kind of isolation*—an isolation which, in its results, proves much more serious than the old. In its anxiety to interpret Biblical thought and language in the context of ancient contemporary extra-Biblical religion and literature, it is apt to forget the immediate and primary psychological context—the context, viz., of the personal experience of the author.¹ This is the central determinative thing making thought, language, practice—all things

¹ In case of N.T. exegesis this leads to the minimizing of the influence of specifically O.T. thought and language on the Biblical authors.

new. It is the failure to do justice to this creative worth of personality and personal experience that is at the root, e.g., of such a judgment as that of Gunkel, 'that the Christianity of Paul is a syncretistic religion.'² As Reischle³ observes, we can only speak of 'syncretism' when the elements of different religions are admitted on equal terms. But in the Pauline thought foreign elements, if present, are but the form or mould into which his genius has poured a new spiritual content. And the first essential for a true exegesis of the Pauline writings—and of the Biblical in general—is a sympathetic understanding and realization of the new experience which is determinative of this new content. Back, therefore, of an exact knowledge of recent philological, archæological, and anthropological investigations, back even of a trained historical imagination, the fundamental requirement for true exegesis is a personal relation to Jesus Christ. Only the man of Christian experience can aright interpret Christian thought and language. This it is the more necessary to emphasize, inasmuch as exegesis is in danger at present of falling largely into the hands of those who are first of all experts or specialists in some one province or field, archæology, philology, anthropology, or mythology; and who, coming, from this extra-biblical or even extra-religious study to the interpretation of the Bible, are apt to proceed as if historical criticism here were, what it is not, an abstract scientific instrument which can be detached from the personal relation of the investigator to the facts examined.

(To be concluded.)

² *Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis des N.T.*, p. 95.

³ *Theologie u. Religionsgeschichte*, p. 36.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF DEUTERONOMY.

DEUTERONOMY xxxiv. 5, 6.

'So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in the valley in the land of Moab over against Beth-peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'There in the land of Moab.'—He had looked upon the land which the Lord had promised to the fathers, for which he had been yearning, and to which all his work had been directed all these years; and now he has had to die, as the text puts it with such pathetic emphasis, 'there in the

land of Moab,' having no part in the fair inheritance.—MACLAREN.

THE spot referred to can be fixed, at least approximately, with tolerable confidence. The tableland of Moab descends gradually to the Jordan valley by a multitude of irregular mountain ridges, intersected by numerous wadys. Among these ridges there is one which bears the name of Neba. Neba is doubtless the ancient Nebo. The ridge terminates in a projecting spur, whence the slopes fall steeply on all sides down to the Jordan valley and the Dead Sea, 3568 feet below.—DRIVER.

'According to the word of the Lord.'—The Hebrew is 'according to the *mouth* of Jehovah.' *Mouth* in the sense of *command* is a common Hebrew idiom; nevertheless the Jews understood it here literally, and from the paraphrase in the Targum arose the Rabbinic legend that Moses died by the kiss of God.—DRIVER.

'And he buried him.'—Though Hebrew idiom would permit the verb to be fairly represented in English by 'they buried him,' or 'he was buried,' yet, in view of the second clause of the verse, the subject intended is doubtless Jehovah.—DRIVER.

'In the valley over against Beth-peor.'—That is, in the very ravine in which Israel at the moment was: probably the Wady Hesban.—DRIVER.

BETH-PEOR was in Reubenite territory (Jos 13²⁰), but Moses' burying-place was outside the boundary.—GIRDLESTONE.

'No man knoweth of his sepulchre.'—The first instance on record of the providential obliteration, so remarkably exemplified afterwards in the gospel history, of the holy places of Palestine; the providential safeguard against their elevation to a sanctity which might endanger the real holiness of the history and religion which they served to commemorate.—STANLEY.

THE SERMON.

The Death of Moses.

By the Right Rev. J. R. Woodford, D.D.

Two great pictures of the death of God's saints are set forth in the Old Testament. One in its surroundings is intensely human; the other is enveloped in an atmosphere of the most mysterious solemnity and awe. The first picture is of the death-bed of Jacob; the death of Moses is the other. There are three kinds of events in Scripture—those that take place in the course of nature, those that are above the usual laws of nature, and between these a third class, which though possibly not supernatural are involved in a darkness which baffles our endeavours to penetrate it. The death of Moses is of this mixed character. The New Testament references deepen the mystery. Moses appears in glory along with Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration; and then St. Jude alludes to a contest between Michael the archangel and Satan over the body of Moses, as though the burial of

the dead prophet by the angels of God had been opposed by the powers of evil.

I. The death of Moses at the very borders of Canaan must have been to Israel a sore perplexity. The man, so grand in his faithfulness, touched with his feet the borders of the promised land, but might not enter in. One hasty speech opposed an insuperable bar to his sharing what thousands of inferior spirits were to enjoy. The truth which such a providence must have forced upon their minds is *the certainty of a reward out of this world*. We find no positive mention in the Pentateuch of a future life; yet never perhaps was the verity of a rest remaining for the children of God after death preached more emphatically to a nation than from the mountain upon which the marvelling tribes sought for Moses and found him not. Thus the death of Moses at the beginning of the history of Israel finds its counterpart in nothing less than the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

II. But besides the general connexion of Moses' death with the doctrine of life everlasting there comes out with sharpness another point—*the personal dealing of the Lord God with the dying man*. The Lord spake unto Moses in that self-same day, saying, 'Get thee up into this mountain and die.' And then the last record of all—'and he (God) buried him in a valley in the land of Moab.' What a coming forth out of the thick darkness here. It assuredly brings God very nigh. The words which hang around the departure of Moses are the words addressed to Abraham: 'I, even I, am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward.'

III. There are two things here. (1) How distinctly we are drawn away from the notion of mere temporal success as the reward of Christian effort. Moses' reward is not here, but hereafter; it is not Canaan, but God. (2) The death of Moses teaches us something about preparation for our own departure. It tells us that on the one hand we cannot wholly dispense with ordinances; and on the other hand that they may not be to us all in all. Unassisted in his last extremity by earthly aids, Moses warns us that the source of our strength in our appointed hour must be in God.

The Death in the Desert.

By the Rev. Adam Scott.

'We must needs die,' said the wise woman of Tekoa. But why must we needs die? There is

no answer but one. It is God's will. Nor was the death of Moses the result of decayed powers. It was God's will that he should die even then and there.

I. In the death of Moses we see the 'severity' of God. How earnestly Moses pleaded that he might 'see the good land.' But God is not to be trifled with. Sin is a reality, and Moses had sinned.

II. In the death of Moses we see God's desire that men should put their trust not in man but in Him. The Book of Deuteronomy closes with a high eulogium upon Moses. Some books conclude with an ascription of praise to God. This is the only book that ends with the commendation of a man. We know not who wrote the words of commendation, but no doubt they expressed the universal feeling of Israel after his death. Had he been spared to bring them into the land there might have been a temptation to enthrone the creature in the place of the Creator.

III. In the death of Moses there is witness to the kindness of God. He could not enter the land, but he was permitted to view it. This was the act of a father to a child; it was the substitution of a lesser blessing for an unattainable greater. Moreover, in the last illness God Himself became his nurse. I heard a daughter say, speaking of her mother's long and fatal illness, 'I am so thankful I was able to nurse her and do everything for her with my own hands all the way through to the end.'

IV. In the death of Moses we see the glory of the grace of God. Of Moses it might be said, 'Nothing in his life became him like the leaving it.' He was marvelled at for his meekness, and this great grace grew with the years. At the last he was at his best.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

THERE is a tradition connected with the battle of Marathon that a peasant fought with great prowess on the side of the Greeks, using a ploughshare for a weapon. When the battle was over he was nowhere to be seen, nor would the oracle divulge anything beyond this—'Care for no man at all. Say but just this: "We praise one helpful whom we call the holder of the ploughshare."'

'Burial by God.'—I have often put to myself the question: Suppose this fragment of the Bible had been lost, should we drop any flower from the garland of revelation? I think we should. I think there is one thing revealed here

which is quite unique and which is planted here alone; I mean the fact that there is such a thing as burial by *God*. Some of the deepest distresses of bereavement come from the denial of funeral rites. Where the body is buried in the mine, where the body is engulfed in the sea, where the body is stretched on the battlefield indistinguishable amid the mutilated slain, there is a deeper tone added to the heart's knell. It is a note which Christianity has rather increased than diminished, for the doctrine of resurrection has consecrated the body and made its very dust dear. To such a state of mind what comfort this passage brings! Here is an explorer lost in the mountain snow. His friends know he is dead; and it adds to their pain that no human lips have consecrated his dust. And to them there comes this voice: Ye that weep for the unfound dead, ye that lament the burial rites denied, know ye not that there are graves which are consecrated by God alone!—GEORGE MATHESON.

'No man knoweth of his sepulchre.'

By Nebo's lonely mountain,
On this side Jordan's wave,
In a vale in the land of Moab
There lies a lonely grave.
And no man knows that sepulchre,
And no man saw it e'er,
For the angels of God upturned the sod,
And laid the dead man there.

That was the grandest funeral
That ever passed on earth;
But no man heard the trampling,
Or saw the train go forth—
Noiselessly as the daylight
Comes back when night is done,
And the crimson streak on ocean's cheek
Grows into the great sun.

O lonely grave in Moab's land!
O dark Beth-peor's hill!
Speak to these curious hearts of ours,
And teach them to be still.
God hath His mysteries of grace,
Ways that we cannot tell;
He hides them deep, like the hidden sleep
Of him He loved so well.

C. F. ALEXANDER.

Nunc Dimittis.—Your dear Archbishop who has left you was from first to last a soldierly man. He was a soldier at the beginning of his long career; he is a soldier at the end. You could see his soldierly character not only in the erectness and dignity of his bearing, not only in the completeness of his humility, but also in the directness and simplicity of his faith. He fulfilled his duty as a man under authority. He felt that he had a Master who called him and commanded him, and it was his duty, quietly, simply, and without ostentation to do what he was told. But perhaps he was never so much the simple and dignified soldier as he was when he laid down his charge. Those familiar words which we have sung to-night, the 'Nunc Dimittis,' are the words of an old soldier. They mean in the Greek: 'Master, now

lettest Thou Thy servant retire from his guard.' And the whole life of the Archbishop for these last few months in his inward soul has been saying the 'Nunc Dimittis' of an old soldier. . . . As I know from my talks with him spiritually, he was a man looking in the face of his Commander, recognizing that the word had been spoken, that his guard might now be left, the charge handed back to Him who gave it, and it was with simplicity of faith, with the directness and dignity of a gentleman, a soldier to the last, that he has gone into the quiet of his resting days.—From the tribute of Archbishop LANG to his predecessor, reported in *The Guardian*, January 27, 1909.

'He appeared in glory.'—That Divine hand, which locked up this treasure, and kept the key of it, brought it forth afterwards glorious. In the Transfiguration, this body, which was hid in the valley of Moab, appeared in the hill of Tabor; that we may know these bodies of ours are not lost but laid up, and shall as sure be raised in glory as they are laid down in corruption.—Bishop HALL, *Contemplations*, vii. 5.

Here,—here's his place, where meteors shoot, clouds form,
Lightnings are loosened,
Stars come and go! Let joy break with the storm,
Peace let the dew send!

Lofty designs must close in like effects;
Loftily lying,
Leave him—still loftier than the world suspects,
Living and dying.

FOR REFERENCE.

- Banks (L. A.), *On the Trail of Moses*, 277.
Beaumont (J. A.), *Walking Circumspectly*, 131.
Davies (J.), *The Kingdom without Observation*, 187.
Hull (E. L.), *Sermons preached at King's Lynn*, 3rd ser. 119.
Ker (J.), *Sermons*, 1st ser. 153.
Maclaren (A.), *Expositions: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel*, 77.
Maclaren (A.), *The Unchanging Christ*, 181.
Matheson (G.), *Messages of Hope*, 50.
Meyer (F. B.), *Moses the Servant of God*, 185.
Minifie (W. C.), *The Mask Torn Off*, 135.
Myres (W. M.), *Fragments that Remain*, 42.
Pearse (M. G.), *Moses: His Life and its Lessons*, 279.
Woodford (J. R.), *Sermons on Subjects from the Old Testament*, 27.
Christian World Pulpit, xx. 3 (A. Scott); xxxiii. 138 (A. Mackennal); lxiii. 326 (W. Lefroy).

The Development of the Religious Consciousness.¹

BY PRINCIPAL THE REV. ALFRED E. GARVIE, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

MANY views are held regarding the origin of religion: it is not the intention of this paper to discuss any of these theories in detail; but, after a brief statement of some of the opinions held, to discover, if possible, the method of inquiry to be pursued, and by application of this method, when found, to fix as accurately as can be what may, with some degree of probability, be regarded as the beginnings of religious thought.

I.

Comte derived all religion from *fetishism*, which, however, he used in a wider sense than is now current, the belief of man that all phenomena were caused by material objects, which evoked his interest, curiosity, fear, or hope. Tylor seeks to explain all religious belief and worship by *animism*, the attribution of life to the phenomena of nature. Tiele further defines this as 'the belief in the existence of souls or spirits, of which only the

powerful acquire the rank of divine beings, and become objects of worship,' and distinguishes two forms of it—*spiritism*, in which the spirits are conceived as moving about freely, and *fetishism*, in which they are localized in an object. Herbert Spencer 'traces religion back to the worship of ancestors under the guise of ghosts as its sole factor.' Pfeleiderer agrees with A. Réville in distinguishing between 'the worship of animated nature (*Naturism*)—which,' he holds, 'must certainly be placed first as the earliest in time—and the belief in spirits (animism, spiritism) developed out of the former,' and reckons 'as a subdivision of the latter the worship of the spirits of ancestors' (*The Philosophy of Religion*, iii. p. 11). In his Gifford Lectures, however, he modifies this view, and regards the belief in God as 'formed out of the prehistorical belief in spirits,' to which he now assigns 'two sources—external nature, and the soul of man,' for he regards the belief in ancestral spirits as being as primitive as the belief in nature spirits (i. 103–104). Jevons declines to

¹ A paper read at the Congress of the History of Religions in Oxford on September 17th, 1908.

admit the common assumption that the religions of savages represent the primitive religion, and denies that evolution must necessarily be progressive, and that therefore the lowest forms of belief and worship must be the earliest. He represents primitive man as investing natural objects with a personality like his own, and even with supernatural powers. He speaks of *totemism*, the alliance of a human tribe with a class of animals or plants as its god, as primitive. He thus credits primitive man with the distinction of the natural and the supernatural, the consciousness of self as spirit separable from the body, the conception of classes in natural objects, the sense of tribal unity. It is evident that when such differences of opinion in explaining the origin of religion exist, it is necessary for us not so much to discuss whether this or that theory is the more plausible, but whether the method of inquiry has been determined with sufficient care, in the hope that the right method may not only put an end to this confusion, but assign to each of these forms of the religious consciousness, regarded as primitive, its proper place in the development.

II.

In criticizing these opposed views it is important that we should define the method of inquiry as rigidly as possible. How can we see with the eyes, hear with the ears, think with the mind, or feel with the heart of the primitive man? One method of recapturing the distant past has already been under our notice. Tiele assumes that the savage may represent him: this Jevons denies. This is the method of comparative ethnology and prehistoric anthropology. But John Stuart Mill has pointed out that savage life shows indications of degeneration rather than primitiveness, the vices of moral depravity rather than the qualities of immaturity. Where the life of the uncivilized races shows less moral corruption, contact with Europeans so quickly brings about changes, that it is difficult to fix the native beliefs and customs by accurate observation and exact description before they have disappeared. These peoples have many centuries of life behind them, and there is no guarantee that there has not been an evolution, though not progressive, as of the civilized races. The primitive man was the ancestor of the civilized man as of the savage; in him then were the possibilities of progress or of deteriora-

tion; it is not likely that stagnation could continue generation after generation. Change is almost certain; and whereas in some conditions change meant progress, in others it resulted in deterioration. It is certain the savage is not the primitive man. It must be pointed out, however, that the theory of animism as an early phase of the religious consciousness does not depend on this assumption. Pfleiderer's earlier view that naturism passed into anthropomorphic polytheism without this as a stage of development is contradicted by the fact that in the religions of civilized races traces of animism can be found. Religious beliefs and customs are persistent, and the lower forms survive in the popular, when the official religion has left them behind. If the primitive man cannot be identified with the savage, still less can we think of him as capable of such advanced thought and feeling as Jevons assigns to him. The beginnings of religion must have been very simple. If we have not an instance of such simplicity in the savage, have we not got it in the child? Thus a second method is offered to us.

As the child physically recapitulates the history of the race, so it may be assumed mentally, morally, and religiously. Hence in recent years the study of the child has become one of the most important branches of psychology. An additional reason why the study of the child is so important is this, that in its purer and more gracious forms religion is so largely a childlike attitude of dependence on, confidence in, and submission to the divine. The child-life has more of the characteristics of the religious life than that of the adult. The study of the child yields certain definite results for our guidance. The child feels before he thinks or wills. He feels pleasure or pain; he wishes and hopes for the good which will make him feel happy, he shuns and dreads the evil that makes him suffer. With this emotionalism there goes the spontaneous activity of the imagination. What he has dreamed is real to him: he does not distinguish fact and fiction; he delights in personifications and exaggerations. It is very slowly that he learns to speak only the truth. He likes to pretend, and it is an accommodation to the ways of grown-up people that he calls his playing a part pretending; to himself it is much more than that. But the world around as it is, not as he would have it be, soon compels his attention, and he is driven to try and know and understand it. His intellect

begins to be active. The curiosity of children is proverbial: their habit of asking questions, and not being easily satisfied with the answers given to them, has caused many parents not a little difficulty, if not irritation. The child wants to know what a thing is, how it is, why it is; the categories of substance, causality, purpose are implicit in his thinking. Gradually the society of home or school, to which he belongs, with its prohibitions and requirements, its restraints on his wishes, and its constraints of his actions, evokes his conscience, his sense of right and wrong, of inclination as different from duty. As he becomes conscious of himself as a person, and of others as persons, faith as the evidence of things not seen becomes possible to him. And thus his mental, moral, and spiritual development begins.

The child, as the modern psychologist observes him, grows in a rational, moral, religious environment; not only is the process of development shortened by the contact of the child with the parents and teachers, but the child takes over much from his surroundings that he would not have gained for himself. He cannot then without qualification be regarded as exactly similar to the primitive man. We must, therefore, have recourse to a third method. What enables the observer and inquirer to interpret the religious consciousness of the savage or of the child, to understand it better than the subject of it does himself, to make explicit what is so largely implicit, to lay bare the process of reasoning that is involved in an intuition, instinct, impulse? Is it not his own consciousness? It must be frankly admitted that in all attempts to recover the earliest phases of the religious consciousness the personal equation is to be reckoned with. We cannot here expect the objectivity of physical science; the subjectivity of the thinker will betray itself. It is hard to understand how those to whom religion is one of the strange errors into which mankind has fallen can possibly do justice to the religious consciousness. Sympathy would seem to be a condition of intelligence. We may then admit as a legitimate method the thinker's reflexion on his own religious life, and the elements of which it is composed, his remembrance, so far as he can command it, of the stages through which he has passed, his valuation, mental and moral, of the contents of his faith. It is not a logical resolution of the contents of religious consciousness into 'bloodless categories,' such as

Hegel's Logic appears to be to the superficial observer that is here needed; it is rather a psychological divination, which will realize the living facts of religion in their sources and connexions. We can analyze the complex experience into its simpler elements; we can recognize that development is gradual, and so trace the links between the more prominent and diverse features of religion which have successively appeared. It is to be hoped that by a combination of these methods, each applied with its necessary limitations, and each supplementing, and where necessary correcting, the others, we may be able to restore the religious consciousness in its earliest phases. Before attempting to do this, the writer may be allowed to make two remarks regarding the personal equation in this inquiry so far as he is himself concerned. He assumes that religion does correspond with the reality of the world; it is the response of man to that which is in his environment, it is the fulfilment by man of a promise of his nature. He assumes, in the second place, that there has been a progress in religion, that at each stage of the development of the religious consciousness the response of man to his environment has brought his thought and life into closer correspondence with the reality of the world, and so man has been becoming more truly what he ought to be. But in such a process, the end can alone interpret the beginning, and in reconstituting the past history we may be guided by the movement towards this end.

III.

Pfleiderer's earlier view that the belief in nature as animated preceded the belief in spirits commends itself as the more probable. The child is aware of living, and thinks of all around him as living before he has any conception of 'self' or of a soul as distinct from a body. It is only gradually that the totality of experience is resolved into its elements, that the self distinguishes itself from the world around, and from its body. We cannot begin with a simpler consciousness than the sense of being alive in a world also alive. In the distinction of objects in the environment the attention was directed by the selective interest. Objects that caused pleasure or pain would first of all attract attention. It is not unlikely that the sun with its light and warmth would be one of the early objects of closer observation. What gratified the wishes

on the one hand, or what inflicted suffering on the other, would be most considered in order to secure or to avoid. Whether fear or hope predominated would depend on whether nature was gracious or hostile. The primitive man had no conception of his personality, but slowly the sense of self would emerge, and there is not a little probability in the assumption that it was the experience in dreams while asleep that first suggested the distinction of soul and body, and even the possibility of a separation of the soul from the body, and that this idea was transferred to the dead. After death the return of the soul to the body as in sleep was expected; only reluctantly was the separation recognized as final, and yet the soul so separated from the body was regarded as still existing. When such a conception of soul or spirit had been reached, then the vague belief in nature as living, or *animatism*, as it has been suggested that this phase of thought should be called, could be more fully and clearly defined. Natural phenomena were due to the action of *spirits* similar to the human. But here two ways of looking at the relation of the spirits to the phenomena seem possible. The spirit may be conceived as taking up its abode in an object, and as necessarily confined to that object, so that its activities could not be detached therefrom. Thus the feather, the stone, or the block of wood might be supposed to possess power because of the spirit localized in it. This way of thinking may be called *fetishism*, although this is a word of ambiguous meaning. To secure the presence of the spirit in such an object among certain savage peoples, a fixed rite must be observed. The object selected is usually some trifle which has been invested casually with significance. A feather blown across the path, a stone on which the foot stumbles, a bit of wood of curious shape may thus attract attention. Fetishism is not the earliest form of religion, and it is a bypath, and not the main road of development. The other way of thinking is this. As the soul can in dreams leave the body, and is thus distinguished from it, so the spirit may be conceived as controlling the natural object without being confined to it. This may be called *spiritism*, or, as that is a term which might suggest ancestor-worship, rather *demonism*. As there is no conception of the unity of nature, but an impression of the multiplicity of things, the spirits are many, and so we have *polydæmonism*. These spirits live

and act; power is their distinctive attribute. The question thus forces itself upon us: how was that power thought of? The description which Jevons gives of the mental process by which the natural was distinguished from the supernatural seems an anachronism. We are better to avoid these terms in this connexion altogether. It may be conceded that what happened regularly, unless the selective interest already spoken of directed attention to it, did not so challenge the curiosity of the primitive man, and call for the only explanation he could offer, the activity of a spirit, as what occurred suddenly or seldom, awaking his surprise or wonder. Soon too would he learn what he could do or could not do, just as we can now see children learning the humbling lesson. As the boy thinks of his father as bigger or stronger before he thinks of him as wiser and better, so probably man thought of the spirits as more powerful than himself, and able to do what he could not. The boy tries to imitate his father without any conscious intention of rivalling him. Magic originally may be not a substitute for religion, or an attempt to get power over the spirits to compel them to do man's will, but an experiment to do what a man believed himself quite capable of doing before he found out the limits of his power. When man did recognize that he could not do many things that were done in the world around him, and done, therefore, as he believed by the spirits, he would try to get on friendly terms with them by his gifts and by his prayers. It seems unnecessary to assume, with Jevons, that the possibility of such an alliance was suggested to him by his intercourse with his dead.

Just as man only slowly distinguished himself from the world around him, and his soul from his body, so the distinction between the animal and the human was only gradually recognized. Man felt and thought himself akin to all living creatures, and he, therefore, conceived the spirits whom he acknowledged as greater, and whose help he sought, in animal as well as in human forms. Polydæmonism is not exclusively *anthropomorphic*, it may be described as *therianthropic*. Traces of this development are found in the religion of Egypt conspicuously. Some gods have animal bodies, others only animal heads. Some are entirely human, but have some animal closely associated with them. It is at this stage in the discussion that *totemism* may be most fitly con-

sidered, although it cannot be regarded as nearly as primitive as Jevons seems to represent it as being. It is doubtful, too, whether it can be regarded as a stage through which all religions have passed. It involves two features which point to a later stage of human development. First of all, it is not an individual animal (or plant) that is chosen as the tribal god; but a class. This implies not only observation, but some powers of generalization. Secondly, the sense of tribal unity is strong; and we cannot assume that this involved no gradual development. Jevons derives the first feature from the second; man conceived of animals and plants as tribes, even as he himself belonged to a tribe; but even if this were so, what has been said about the mental process involved still holds good. Other spirits were still recognized, but the totem was exalted to be the tribal deity. The totem animal was regarded as so closely akin to his human worshippers, that stories were told of the descent of the tribe from the animal. As on the one hand the family became conscious of a separate unity within the tribe, and as on the other hand man distinguished himself more thoroughly from the animal, ancestor-worship may be supposed to have appeared. That there was belief in the spirits of the dead long before ancestor-worship became a definite form of religion may be assumed. Man's consciousness of himself as distinct from, superior to, all other creatures influenced his conception of the spirits he worshipped. His religion became more *anthropomorphic*. As his knowledge of nature grew, his sense of the greatness of the spirits who ruled nature also developed, and *polydæmonism* passed into *polytheism*. The god was less closely attached to the natural object with which the spirit had at an earlier stage been connected. He was conceived more distinctly as human in form and character; and as the natural object could not now represent him, art, however rude at its beginnings, sought to place before the worshipper some semblance of the deity. Thus the god and the idol seem to be related.

One other phase of the development must yet be noted. The multitude of spirits was still believed in, but a tribal deity, whether always a totem is doubtful, was given the first place. Thus there was a crude monotheism or rather monolatry. The union of tribes in a nation arrested this development. The tribal deities were com-

bined in a national pantheon. Where the resemblance between the local gods was close enough, then there was syncretism, the fusion of the two deities in one with probably various names. When in such a national movement, one city or district took a lead, the god of 'the predominant partner' enjoyed a supremacy over the other gods, as Amon-Ra in Egypt, Marduk in Babylon, and Ashur in Assyria. Besides this monarchy in the pantheon, two other instances of tendency towards monotheism may be noted. The one is *henotheism*, as Max Müller calls it, and the other is *pantheism*—the former due to piety, the latter the result of speculation. The worshipper so concentrated his attention on, and was absorbed by interest in, the one deity he was addressing that, for the time at least, he thought of no other god, and endowed the god worshipped with all the attributes and functions of deity. The Vedic hymns offer examples of this henotheism. When men began to reason about the gods, it was impossible for the mind to rest in multiplicity, and so in the speculations of priests in Egypt and Ascetics in India not only the unity of the divine, but also the identity of god and the world, became the supreme article of faith. One exception to this anthropomorphic polytheism with its modifications in henotheism or pantheism there was. The tribal deity of the Hebrews—Yahweh—came in the course of the religious development of the nation to be regarded as the sole and absolute deity, endowed with perfect moral character. This 'ethical monotheism' has been inherited by the Christian Church; it is still the possession of Judaism, and Islam with some modification of the conception has become its fervent champion. It is certain that if belief in the divine is to survive in modern times, it must be conceived as unity. The issue of the future seems to be between the monotheistic and the pantheistic representation of that unity; but it would not be proper to the purpose of this paper to advocate the one or the other.

This attempt to reconstruct, from the indications that the materials collected by the science of comparative religion in regard to men's religious thought and life afford us, the development of the religious consciousness cannot claim more than probability. But it is an attempt worth making; as the danger here is towards specialism on the one hand, or speculation on the other. Some are content with collecting the facts without seeking their bond of

union; others are ambitious to prove a thesis by the use of the facts. The writer has attempted 'to think things together' without ignoring any of the relevant facts. Although the expression of personal belief would be out of place in a gathering such as

this is, yet he cannot close without expressing his conviction that this search after God, so persistent and often so pathetic, cannot have been in vain, but that God has indeed been found wherever sincerely sought.

Literature.

A NEW COMMENTARY.

A COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE. By Various Writers. Edited by the Rev. J. R. Dummelow, M.A. (*Macmillan*. 7s. 6d. net.)

THE first thing that every one will say who looks at this book is that there is plenty of it for the money. But the book must be carefully examined. And every one who examines it carefully will say, next, that it is the best single-volume commentary that has been written in English.

The editor is a clergyman of the Church of England. He has given himself to this single enterprise for the last eight or ten years. For what he would do he would do thoroughly. He did not dream of writing the whole commentary himself (has he written a word of it?); but he enlisted the best men who would write for him, and he has so watched the progress of the work that it is now before us, a well-printed, consistent, up-to-date, reliable single-volume commentary on the whole Bible.

May we risk a word of criticism? There were good reasons for using the Authorized Version, but why is so much space spent on printing the readings of the Revised? This is the comment on Rev 22¹¹: Cp. Ezk 3²⁷ 20³⁹, Dan 12¹⁰. *Unjust* R.V. 'unrighteous.' *Be unjust* R.V. 'do unrighteousness.' *Be filthy* R.V. 'be made filthy.' *Be righteous* R.V. 'do righteousness.' That is an extreme case. But there is much that is somewhat like it. Space would have been saved considerably if we had been recommended to use the commentary with a copy of the Revised Version in our hands.

There is a series of essays at the beginning of the book, occupying 150 pages. They deal with subjects like 'The Laws of Hammurabi,' 'Belief in God,' 'The Person of Jesus Christ.' They are all well written, some of them with distinction.

Then comes the Old Testament Commentary, which fills about 600 pages, followed by the New, which occupies 400. The standpoint is critical but not continental. Thus the editor of St. Matthew adopts 'the now widely accepted view that the demoniacs of the N.T. were insane persons under the delusion that they were 'possessed with devils.' But the same editor decides that the 'sign of Jonah' was not Christ's preaching, but His resurrection from the dead.

The exposition generally avoids the obvious, and it is frequently forcible. Thus, we know that at the time when the Authorized Version was made the verb to *follow* was much stronger than it is now, and often meant to 'pursue,' as in Shakespeare's 'I have ever followed thee with hate.' There is an instance in Ps 23⁶, 'Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life.' The comment is, 'Goodness and mercy, like two angels, pursue the Psalmist, determined, as it were, to run him down.'

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOCIAL REFORM.

THE NEW ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOCIAL REFORM. (*Funk & Wagnalls*. Two Vols.)

This is a second edition. But it deserves more attention than can usually be given to second editions. For, as the Preface assures us, it is not the old edition revised, but a completely new book. There are some, indeed there are several, articles retained as they were, but the great majority of them seem to be new, and altogether the book deserves the attention which should be paid to a new book.

It is an encyclopædia of Social Reform. That is a very different thing from what an encyclopædia of Socialism would be. Socialism, whether in theory or in practice, must be banished from the

mind as utterly as possible. Who stands first and foremost in the plate pages of portraits? Who but the Emperor of Germany. And he is not a Socialist. It is an encyclopædia of all the things that men and women are interested in as they seek to fulfil the second of the two great commandments of the law: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

The first question is, Who is my neighbour? That is answered in articles dealing with factories, mines, breweries, the London docks, and the like. And with that answer comes the answer to the other question also: 'How am I to show my love to him?' Every scheme of every reformer in every land is described. For this new edition is in comprehensiveness a great advance on the old, and seems at last to have left little out.

Nevertheless we have one or two hints to give. First of all, the British Supplement is placed at the beginning of the first volume, when its information should have been found under the proper articles in the body of the book. Next, that same British Supplement is too meagre. The articles in it are just getting into their subject when they come to an end. And they are too few. Thus there are in the book articles on the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. movements, but they are occupied entirely with America. Clearly there is still an opportunity left for a third edition when this one is exhausted.

THE OXFORD CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS FOR THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. (Clarendon Press. Two Vols. 21s. net.)

These handsome volumes recall to those who attended the Congress one of the most inspiring experiences of life. To meet the men, to hear the papers, perhaps to share the discussions, to feel the glamour of 'that beastly old place' (as the American tourist called it, or is falsely reported to have called it)—all combined to make an undying and most gratifying memory.

The study of the volumes, even though many of the papers are given only in abstract, will do much for those who could not be present. To some they will be a great surprise. So many men, the most honourable in the ranks of scholarship, and all so absorbed in the study of—Religion!

The study has come in such volume, and some of us have been so behind and unprepared for it, that the sections into which the book is divided will be bewildering. There are nine sections in all—Section I., Religions of the Lower Culture; Section II., Religions of China and Japan; Section III., Egyptian Religion; Section IV., Religions of the Semites; Section V., Religions of India and Iran; Section VI., Religions of the Greeks and Romans; Section VII., Religions of the Germans, Celts, and Slavs; Section VIII., the Christian Religion; Section IX., Method and Scope of the History of Religions. But the bewilderment slowly dissipates; there are avenues from the one section to the other; there is a broad stream of humanity; at last all roads lead to Christ.

Two of the papers (only summarized here) have been published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Let them stand as examples of the book's contents. And let it be remembered that this is the study of the future and that it is already with us.

Among the Books of the Month.

The Monthly Visitor for 1908 (68 Hanover Street, Edinburgh) is as welcome as ever. It carries no gossip from house to house. It 'has pity on the multitude.'

Messrs. Blackie's 'Red Letter' Library now contains *Poems*, by Russell Lowell (1s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Burns & Oates are the publishers of *The Catholic Directory* (1s. 6d. net). Like other directories it is half built of advertisements. But even they are worth reading. And for the rest, no Protestant, not even the least polemical, can be without it.

The University of California has sent a selection from its Publications in American Archæology and Ethnology. They are (1) *Types of Indian Culture in California*, by Dr. A. L. Kroeber. Dr. Kroeber is the highest authority on the religion of the Californian Indians. (2) *The Earliest Historical Relations between Mexico and Japan*, by Miss Zelia Nuttall. Miss Nuttall knows only Mexico and Central America (she once told us), but she knows

them thoroughly. (3) *Indian Myths of South Central California*, by Dr. A. L. Kroeber. (4) *Navaho Myths, Prayers, and Songs*, by the late Washington Matthews and Mr. P. E. Goddard. Again, Washington Matthews was the one great authority on the Athapascans of the South, but Mr. Goddard has come into his knowledge and stands unrivalled now. (5) *The Religion of the Luiseno Indians of Southern California*, by Miss Constance Goddard Dubois. The name of Miss Dubois is new to us. This is a great essay, however. And California is great enough to admit of more than one worker. What a revelation of the mind of man it is to come upon books like these. The beginner in the study of primitive religion is greatly to be envied. How many are the intellectual surprises; how warm is the feeling of fellowship for man in his great struggle. Ever as we read, the words of St. Paul keep ringing in our ears: 'If haply they might . . . find Him.'

When the World's Sunday School Convention took place in Jerusalem the members were fortunate in finding there, as director of the American School of Oriental Study and Research, Professor Paton of Hartford. They made him their guide to the city; for they could find no other man or book trustworthy or intelligible. Whereupon Professor Paton resolved to write an account of *Jerusalem in Bible Times*. The chapters of it were first contributed to the *Biblical World* of Chicago; the volume is now published at the Chicago University Press (\$1). Besides its absolute accuracy (for Professor Paton is one of the most reliable scholars of our day), it is noticeable for its illustrations, some of which are from photographs by the author himself.

Among the lecturers at the Congress of Religions in Oxford was Mr. L. H. Jordan, the author of *Comparative Religion*. Mr. Jordan's topic was the same as the subject of his book. He has now published the paper through the Oxford University Press (1s. net).

To the 'Oxford Poets' Mr. Frowde has added *James Thomson* (2s.), edited by Mr. J. Logie Robertson, M.A.

Mr. Frowde has also issued a small-type thin-paper edition of *Hymns*, by Horatius Bonar (1s.).

Does Mr. Frowde mean to issue a new series

of Commentaries? Or is the Rev. A. S. Walpole's *St. Mark* (1s. 6d.) a solitary venture? It is the text of the Revised Version with the shortest, simplest notes, and with very useful apparatus of maps and illustrations.

We are offered a new edition of the Prophets. The title is *The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers* (Clarendon Press; vol. i., 2s. 6d. net). The editors are the Rev. F. H. Woods, B.D., and the Rev. F. E. Powell, M.A., both thoroughly equipped for the work. They have taken the Revised Version and printed it in the form of poetry, where it *is* poetry. More than that, they have divided it into paragraphs with headings, and they have added notes in explanation. The conspicuous feature is the paragraph or strophe division. That gives the book distinction. Notice also that when they prefer the margin of the Revised Version, the editors mark it with an obelus. There will be four volumes. The first volume contains Amos, Hosea, Isaiah i.-xxxix., and Micah.

A volume has come from the Clarendon Press which has far more significance in its existence than in its contents. And yet the worth of its contents is great. For it contains six lectures delivered by men so eminent as Professor A. J. Evans, Dr. Andrew Lang, Dr. Gilbert Murray, Professor F. B. Jevons, Professor J. L. Myres, and Mr. W. Warde Fowler. Yet the writing of these men, each handling the subject he knows best, is not so important as the mere fact that the University of Oxford did, through its Committee for Anthropology, invite them to deliver lectures on the subject of *Anthropology and the Classics* (6s. net) during the Michaelmas Term of 1908. The University of Oxford has discovered that Greek and Latin can no longer be profitably studied apart from the study of the lower cultures, apart from those studies which are conveniently if vaguely embraced under the name of Anthropology. The men chosen to lecture had already made that discovery. They are men who are distinguished for a knowledge both of the Classics and of Anthropology. Is it the Classics only that have to be rescued from the tread-mill by the comparative method? The study of Theology must be rescued also.

The surprise of the new volume of *The Christian*

World Pulpit (James Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.) occurs at the very end of it. It is a sermon by a lady. And by a Scotch lady, by the wife of a minister of the United Free Church of Scotland. Moreover, it is a very good sermon, short, social, intelligible. It has two texts, the juxtaposition of which shows understanding—'forgetting those things which are behind' (Ph 3¹³), and 'Strengthen the things which remain' (Rev 3²). Otherwise the volume is remarkable that it opens with a great sermon by Professor Peake on 'Christ's last Temptation,' and that in the middle of it there is an equally great sermon by Professor George Adam Smith on 'Christianity and Islam the Battle-field of the Future.'

The Rev. F. Warburton Lewis, B.A., of Cambridge, is keenly interested in the study of the Bible, and when he preaches he has always some fresh thought to unburden his mind of. In the new volume, *The Work of Christ* (Culley; 2s. 6d. net), these new thoughts are more in number and more suggestive, we think, than ever before. The sermons are chosen to be read consecutively. Then there will be found one great thought, new and very fruitful, running throughout the volume.

The disciples said, 'Lord, teach us to pray.' And when He taught them He intended that they should go and teach others. So here is the Rev. A. E. Balch, M.A., teaching to pray with much reasonable persuasiveness. His title is simply *Prayer* (Culley; 1s. net).

But when He taught them He taught them by means of the Lord's Prayer, as we call it. So, by means of *The Lord's Prayer*, the Rev. John T. Waddy, B.A., teaches others to pray (Culley; 1s. 6d. net). It is a small book, but it is the result of much prayer and study.

To the marvellously cheap series of 'Materials for the use of Theological Lecturers and Students,' selected by H. Lietzmann, and published in an English form at 6d. each by Deighton, Bell, & Co., Cambridge, Professor Swete has recently added a very useful number containing *Two New Gospel Fragments*. The first of these is an edition with commentary of the fragment of an uncanonical Gospel discovered by Drs. Grenfell and Hunt at Oxyrhynchus, and first published by them in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, v. p. 1 ff. The second is another

find of great interest recently reported from America. According to Jerome (*c. Pelag.* 2. 15), after St. Mark 16¹⁴ there stood in certain MSS a passage, of which he gives the Latin version. In none, however, of the extant MSS and VSS of the Gospel was any trace of the original discoverable, until in 1907 it was found to occur, along with some further verses not cited by Jerome, in a fifth-century codex of the Four Gospels purchased in Cairo by Mr. C. L. Freer, of Detroit, U.S.A. The whole passage has been fully discussed by Professor C. R. Gregory, of Leipzig, in an important monograph, *Das Freer-Logion* (Leipzig, 1908), but it can also be conveniently studied in Professor Swete's above-mentioned manual, where it is pronounced 'not Marcan,' but 'conceivably as early as the twelve verses which form the latter part of Cent. II. have passed as part of the Second Gospel.'

The Rector of Rockland St. Mary, Norwich, is innocent enough to think that he can make money by publishing his sermons. 'The profits,' he says, 'will be given to the fund for the restoration of Rockland St. Mary Church.' And yet (though Rockland St. Mary may never be restored) *Stepping Stones to Light*, by the Rev. J. K. Swinburne (Norwich: Goose & Co.; 3s. net), is a volume of good strong intellectual sermons, some of them dealing in no childish fashion with subjects like the Origin of Evil and the Argument from Design.

The difficulties of a modern average unbeliever with the miracles of the New Testament are frankly stated in *Miracles and Myths of the New Testament*, by Joseph May, LL.D. (Green; 1s. 6d. net). Are the difficulties all his own? Where would he be without 'Lecky, from whom I have drawn so largely for my illustrations and my arguments'? For foundation to his unbelief he still rests on Hume. He says that Hume's dictum: 'there is always more probability that testimony should err than that a miracle should take place,' remains permanently inexpugnable.

The new volumes of Dr. Maclaren's *Expositions of Holy Scripture* contain the last half of St. Luke and the Epistle to the Romans (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. each). In both volumes there are flashes of Christian boldness. What is the great scientific objection to the gospel? It is

that God has no special concern with a dot of a world like ours. And what is the answer? It is in these words: 'A certain man had a hundred sheep . . . one of them went astray . . . he went into the wilderness to find it.'

The sixth volume of the seventh series of *The Expositor* is out in its black cloth binding (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). It contains the last of Professor Orr's papers on the Resurrection, five articles on the Papyri by Dr. Moulton and Dr. Milligan, several contributions by Professor G. A. Smith and Sir W. M. Ramsay, and many separate articles, that are as timely as they are permanent. *The Expositor* never was worthier.

The son of a long line of Presbyterian ministers in the Highlands of Scotland, Donald Sage Mackay spent his life in America, a great preacher, 'with a style often vividly dramatic which the surge of real passion saved from being theatrical,' and died at the early age of forty-four. He said himself, 'The strenuous life is living up to the measure of our strength, but the strained life is living beyond the measure of our strength.'

Professor Hugh Black has selected the sermons and written the introductory biography. The title is taken from the first sermon—'Thy going out and thy coming in'—*The Religion of the Threshold* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). They are not theological sermons, which is a miracle of heredity; they are wholly of the day's duty. One of them is characteristic of all. Say the twentieth, on the man who 'did no miracle.' First, the things that are not needed for effective witness-bearing—not an eloquent preacher, an æsthetic church, an artistic choir; not large room; not immediate acceptance. Next, the things that are needed—sincerity in all things; and Christ as centre. Then this to end with: 'In the centre of the city of Glasgow, in one of the old churchyards now closed, there is one humble grave containing the body of a factory girl, humbly educated, for many years weak in health, and who lived alone in a single room. In one of the mission churches she taught a class of rough unruly boys; faithfully, tenderly, year after year, she told them the simple story of the Cross, and one by one through her influence these lads were led to give their hearts to Christ. That was all her work. She rests to-day amid the throb and roar

of the city which scarcely knew her, and on her tombstone these simple words tell the story of her life: "She did no miracle, but all things she said of Jesus were true, and many believed on Him there."'

Dr. Whitehouse has finished the second volume of his *Isaiah* for the Century Bible (Jack; 2s. 6d. net). It is divided into two parts. The first part contains Deutero-Isaiah, the second Trito-Isaiah; Deutero-Isaiah being chapters 40 to 55, and Trito-Isaiah chapters 56 to 66. Each part has an introduction of its own. Dr. Whitehouse has again used all the archæological data, up to the very moment of writing, for the elucidation of his author. And he is sometimes quite brilliant in translation.

Messrs. Luzac have issued the third part of the *Encyclopædia of Islam*. It runs from Adana to Ahmed al-Badawi. We hope it is going to secure many readers in its English form. There is no better means of coming to a knowledge of Muhammadanism.

Three Islamic saints, Hasan, Ibn Adham, and Junaid, are commemorated in *Saints of Islam* by Husain R. Sayani, B.A. (Luzac; 2s. 6d. net). And the occasion is used to describe the philosophy (it was scarcely religion) that sustained them.

Professor Hermann Gollancz has been occupying himself in translating the Targum to the Song of Songs, the Book of the Apple, the Story of the Ten Jewish Martyrs, and Leo de Modena's Dialogue on Games of Chance, all from their original Hebrew and Aramaic. And he has so translated them that he will communicate his own joy in the work to every reader of his book. He has not only done all this for us himself, but he has also induced his brother, Professor Israel Gollancz, to add a poetical version and paraphrase of the Ten Martyrs.

To the Christian the most interesting part of the book, which is called *Translations from Hebrew and Aramaic* (Luzac; 5s. net), is the Targum to the Song of Songs. The interpretation is allegorical; the 'beloved' is God, and the 'bride' is the congregation of Israel. The Christian interpretation is its lineal descendant indeed (through Origen), with the change of God to Christ and Israel to the Church.

Messrs. Luzac have issued the third volume of their most promising series on Oriental Religions. It is *Semitic Magic, its Origins and Development* (10s. 6d. net). It is written by Mr. R. Campbell Thompson, M.A., of the British Museum. Mr. Thompson has already made himself a name by his book on the Demonology of Babylon. Here he is on more delicate ground, for he takes his evidence largely from the Old Testament, and many of his readers will find themselves looking at familiar facts in a most unfamiliar atmosphere.

Thus there is a long discussion of the origin of that much misunderstood custom, the redemption of the firstborn. Out of the various hypotheses Mr. Thompson selects that of Dr. Frazer for approval. The custom is a relic of cannibalism. It is a survival under civilization which tells of a time when men gave their firstborn in sacrifice to the deity, and then with the deity shared the sacrificial meal. 'Whether,' he says, 'there remains enough evidence to show that the Hebrews of the more historical period did eat human flesh is doubtful; but that their traditions indicate that their Semitic forefathers did so is, I think, quite obvious.'

But apparently he regards cannibalism itself, not as a stage in the ascent of man, but a falling away from a better manner. For if the Hebrews did practise it, they learned the practice, he reckons, in that barren land Arabia, 'the home of the Hebrews, at least before they split up into their various nationalities.' In other words, they were driven to it by hunger.

Altogether Mr. Thompson gives us much to think of, and not a little to shrink from. But the study of religion is the study of our day, and this book cannot by any means be ignored.

The new volume of Messrs. Macmillan's series of commentaries entitled 'The Bible for Home and School' is *The Acts* (4s.). The editor is Dr. G. H. Gilbert. As the general editor is Professor Shailer Mathews of Chicago, it will be understood that every volume will be critically up to date and not out of touch with good scholarship. Dr. Gilbert is well forward, but he has considered every suggestion made by Harnack or any other.

One of the multiplying series of lectureships on Religion is the Hartford-Lamson lectureship of

Hartford Theological Seminary. To make the lectures thoroughly scientific and attractive the trustees invited Principal Jevons of Durham to deliver last year's course. The lectures are now published under the title of *An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion* (Macmillan).

In his chapter on Prayer (we take it as characteristic), Principal Jevons points out first of all that the missionary has often merely to direct, not to create, the habit of prayer. Not only so. The missionary finds that the things prayed for are not to be indiscriminately condemned. If he is a missionary to the Khonds of Orissa, he will hear them pray thus: 'We are ignorant of what it is good to ask for. You know what is good for us. Give it to us.'

Sir Henry Wrixon, K.C., has written a book about *The Religion of the Common Man* (Macmillan; 3s. net). It is not, of course, his own religion. And just who the common man is, we have not clearly discovered. But whoever he is, his religion is an elementary one. He is not concerned about the offices of Christ, he is occupied with the existence of God. He has more of a heart, too, than a head. He responds at once to the words, 'The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy,' and he is much amazed when you tell him they are the words of a Hebrew psalmist, and 'three thousand years old.'

The Rev. John P. Jones, D.D., has written a book about India, and called it *India, its Life and Thought* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). If the title is a correct one, the life and thought of India is comprehended in one thing, the search for God. This is the sum of the book. And it might just as well have been called 'the Religion of India.' Dr. Jones knows what he is doing. He has lived in the South, but the South and the North are alike in this. The life of India is a religious life; the thought of India is thought about God. Out of all the problems that vex the statesman in his dealings with India, cut the religious element, and at once they cease to be problems. This is amply established by Dr. Jones in the first thirty pages of his book. After that he is wholly occupied with religion.

It is the religion of Southern India that he knows best. And it is well. For the North with its faiths and practices has been well described in

books like Mr. Crooke's, while the South has been neglected. It may be that to the Christian the religion of the North and the religion of the South are indistinguishable, just as all savages seem born of one father to the European when he first comes among them. Yet no man who knew only the North would dream of writing about the religion of the South.

Dr. Jones describes what he has seen, and draws conclusions. One of his conclusions is that to the Hindu the very ideal of life is one thing, to the Christian quite another. He expresses the difference by saying that to the Hindu the buffeting of the body is an end in itself, to the Christian it is a means to an end, the end being not self-effacement but self-realization.

How puzzling the matter of perfection is. Some Memorials have been published of the life of the Rev. Francis Paynter under the title of *Life Radiant* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Paynter was just the man to be drawn by the hope and to tremble before the impossibility of perfection. At last he concluded that the word was used in the Bible in the way of imputation. 'I can quite conceive that Christians may be said to be perfect in Christ, though so imperfect in themselves. Perhaps this may be the meaning of the Apostle when he says, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect." But the word, the English word, has changed its meaning, and the Greek word does not express what the English word has come to express in our day.

The book is very evangelical, and the atmosphere of Keswick is about it always.

Another missionary book from Southern India, and again by a lady. The title is *Glimpses of Indian Life*, the author Miss H. S. Streatfeild (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d.). All is vivid that comes from the South, for it is fresh and it has the possibility of anything in it—even the renunciation of caste. There is some beautiful photographs, one of a native Christian and his family, well worth the price of the book.

Messrs. Marshall have also published a small volume of Studies on the Apocalypse by Mr. A. G. Morgan, called *Last Days* (2s. 6d.).

We should think that the Bishop of Durham never wrote an introduction to a book more

heartily than the one he has written for *Half-Hours with the Minor Prophets*, by Mr. J. P. Wiles, M.A. (Morgan & Scott; 2s. net). For Mr. Wiles has no difficulty whatever with the Book of Jonah, and resolutely declines to discuss the whale. 'We will not stay to discuss the question whether a fish can swallow a man, whether a man swallowed by a fish could remain in its bowels for three days and three nights and then be vomited forth alive upon the dry land, whether a gourd could spring up in one night and perish in another. It is enough for us that these things are written in the Word of God, and that they are confirmed by the express testimony of Jesus Christ our Lord.'

Besides that, Mr. Wiles is a scholar. He is a scholar and a man of letters. He has rendered the Book of Lamentations into English verse with a fidelity and felicity which will draw to him every lover of literature and every student of the Bible. And his prose paraphrases of the Prophets are quite wonderfully accurate and enlightening.

Mr. Nutt has published a *Record of the Proceedings of the First International Moral Education Congress*. The Congress was held at the University of London on September 25-29, 1908.

Do not lose sight of Dr. Paul Carus. He is author, editor, publisher; and he plays all his parts successfully. His independence is sometimes staggering, but he is no unbeliever or iconoclast. When he writes a book on *The Bride of Christ* (Open Court Publishing Co.) be sure that it is no orthodox treatise on the Church; but when you discover that it is 'a study in Christian legend lore,' do not fear that it will subvert your faith. Through devious and yet delightful ways he leads us, always illuminating the path by means of the most charming illustrations, and he brings us to rest at last in a thankful contemplation of the peace which the mystical love of Christ was able to bring to the devout though superstitious Catholic saints of the early ages of the Cross.

From Dr. Carus's Press in Chicago there comes also this month a fine scholarly edition and translation of *The Fragments of Empedocles*. It is the work of Professor W. E. Leonard, of the University of Wisconsin. Here is one of the smallest of the fragments: *νηστεύσαι κακότητος*, 'O fast from evil-

doing.' Does it not remind us of the prophet's 'Render your heart'? _____

Messrs. Passmore & Alabaster have issued the fifty-fourth yearly volume of *The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit* (7s. 6d.). In doing so they announce that they have sermons of Spurgeon's still on hand to last for nine or ten years, and they mean to issue them weekly, monthly, and yearly all that time. It is a wonderful thing; in sermon production quite unexampled. But if they do not run out literally, do they not run dry metaphorically? Not a bit of it. There was no selection in the early volumes, and so there is no refuse now.

Messrs. Kegan Paul are showing much enterprise in the volumes that they are issuing of the 'International Scientific Series' since they took it up again. Preachers as preachers, apart from any scientific learning, should look at them. The new volume is as useful as it is timely. It is a translation of M. Charles Depéret's *Transformations of the Animal World* (5s.). Under that title M. Depéret discusses crucial topics like the Origin of the Flood, Successive Creations, the Influence of Environment, Haeckel's absurdities, and the Appearance of Life on the Globe.

Mr. Ernest Oldmeadow has written a most lively introduction to Dr. Groves Campbell's essay on *Apollonius of Tyana* (Grant Richards; 3s. 6d. net). And he has contrived to make it an exhaustive accurate bibliography. The essay is written with care, fine feeling, good taste. Wherein lies the difference between Apollonius and Christ—those two, born in the same year perhaps, and often compared together? 'Viewing the fall of Apollonius's life, we find it does not differ from its height in respect of spiritual Love. The Peace of Vast Plains and the Silence of Solitary Mountains were ever in his heart, but he never heard the singing of the Seraphim—the Seraphim who, most aflame with Love, are nearest God. He was never lifted up, during all his life, into the burning plane of Adoration and Love which Christians only know. And in the extreme hour he turned from the affections and comfort of his fellow-man. He looked for Peace, and not for Love.' _____

There is a medical man in Bath, Dr. Charles

J. Whitby, who takes his pastime in the study of Neo-Platonism. He has studied it, too, sufficiently to write a book about it. *The Wisdom of Plotinus*, he calls it (Rider; 2s. net). He has gone to the source. He has studied that marvellous work of beauty and worth, *The Enneads*, and he knows not only what to quote from it, but also what is the value of the quotation. _____

M. Edouard Schuré's *Hermes and Plato*, which now appears in a good English translation by Mr. F. Rothwell, B.A. (Rider; 1s. 6d. net), is not a philosophical but a mystical study. The Hermes part has most matter in it; but the part that is given to Platonism on its mystical side is the most original, and will be read with the greatest interest. To not a few the book will be an introduction to a new writer, an acquaintance which they will be anxious to deepen into friendship. _____

Such an imposing volume is Dr. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality* (Sonnenschein; 12s. net), that to open it accidentally and find the eye lighting upon the statement that 'time, like space, has most evidently proved not to be real, but to be a contradictory appearance,' has something incongruous about it. It is not the only thing in the book that looks incongruous. But that is on the most superficial examination. This bulky book, which finds no reality in space any more than in time, is a very real, and has proved a very momentous, contribution to the philosophical thought of our day. There is plenty of paradox in it also. But again the paradox is on the surface. Dr. Bradley disowns all such frivolity. 'It is a moral duty not to be moral.' That sounds like a paradox. But Dr. Bradley denies the paradox even in that. For the meaning is that every separate aspect of the universe goes on to demand something higher than itself. Morality must lose itself in a higher form of being. Its end must be sought in something that is super-moral.

But we need not begin to review the book at this time of day. Though Dr. Bradley was surprised when it reached a second edition, this is the fifth large impression of it; and we may depend upon it that it is far from being the last.

Another great book of which Messrs. Swan

Sonnenschein have issued a new edition is Owen's *Skeptics of the Italian Renaissance* (10s. 6d.). It is the third edition. There is not a word of preface, new or old, for not a word of preface is necessary. The erudition of the book is astonishing. This is the kind of bibliography to imitate; this is the kind of index to make a model of. And the inspiration is not clogged by the erudition, it is fed by it. With art as well as conviction, Owen appeals to the imagination; while his very method, so largely biographical, and entering into the intimacies of biography, gives him a wide range of reader.

One of the sermons in Archdeacon Wilberforce's new volume, *The Hope that is in Me* (Elliot Stock; 5s.), is entitled 'Mental Concentration.' Its text is 'Whatsoever things are lovely, think on these things' (Ph 4⁸). How is the precept to be fulfilled? Not by ignoring pain, weakness, illness and other unlovely things, but by thinking of them all 'in God.' He gives Emily Brontë as an example (spelling the name Brontë). Outwardly the circumstances of her life were troubled enough. Yet she wrote these lines, 'in some respects the finest ever penned'—

No coward soul is mine,
No trembler in the world's storm-troubled sphere:
I see Heaven's glories shine,
And faith shines equal, arming me from fear.

Then the title of Dr. Wilberforce's next sermon is 'Thinking into God,' its text 'Thou shalt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee' (Is 26³).

There is irresistible fascination to some men's minds in numbers. Mr. E. M. Smith has already written on the Mystery of Three. Now he writes on *The Mystery of Seven* (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d.).

Mr. Elliot Stock has also issued a Book for the Forty Days of Lent, by Helen Thorp, entitled *With Christ to Gethsemane* (2s. net).

Towards Social Reform is the title of Canon and Mrs. S. A. Barnett's new book (Fisher Unwin; 5s. net). The word 'towards' has a fine modesty about it. There is plenty of actual social reform, both

recorded as having been accomplished and outlined as demanding accomplishment. One question that is forced to the front by this book is the place of literature in the Social Reform of the future. What the literature is that at present starves the souls of London children is told in the answer made by one of the boys to the question what *books* they read in their country visit. His answer was, *Chips, Comic Cuts, The World's Comic, Funny Cuts, The Funny Wonder, Comic Home Journal*.

The book is in five parts—Social Reformers, Poverty, Education, Recreation, and Housing. And each part is made up of chapters, the authorship of which is in every case assigned either to Canon Barnett or to his wife.

Messrs. Washbourne continue the issue of Father Zulueta's *Letters on Christian Doctrine* (2s. 6d. net). This is Part II. of the second series on the 'Seven Sacraments.'

The *R.P.A. Annual* for 1909 (Watts; 6d.) is as daring in thought and as glaring in colour as ever.

Do not despise and neglect it. There are thousands who make its contents their mental, moral, and spiritual daily food.

The Church of Scotland Year-Book may be had from the Office, 72 Hanover Street, Edinburgh (6d.).

The editor of *Life and Work* (Edinburgh, 2s.) is as 'valuable an asset' as the Church of Scotland possesses. The new volume is loyal and representative as ever.

Mr. W. H. Holmes, Chief of the Bureau of American Ethnology, has issued his *Twenty-Sixth Annual Report*. It belongs to the year 1904-1905.

After the report proper (which speaks especially of the issue of the great 'Handbook of American Indians'), the volume contains two highly important essays, one on the Pima Indians, by Mr. Frank Russell; the other on the Tlingits, by Mr. John R. Swanton. Both papers are intimate and exhaustive; and they are furnished with illustrations on a scale of lavishness the envy of all societies and secretaries. The Index is as usual nearly perfect.

Some Problems of Herod's Temple.

BY THE REV. A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

VII. THE BEAUTIFUL GATE OF THE TEMPLE.

ONE all-important factor in any attempt to re-construct in imagination or in a model the temple of Herod is continually forgotten, the fact, namely, that the sanctuary, as above defined, was a fortress as well, indeed one of the strongest fortresses in Palestine. No plan can be accepted as satisfactory which does not emphasize this element in the construction of the walls and gates. A comparison of the most reliable statements of our chief authorities (*J.W.* v. v. 2, 3; *M.M.* i. 4, 5) shows that access from the great court to the courts of the sanctuary was by nine gates (marked H 1-9 on the plan). Of these four were in the north, four in the south, and one in the east wall respectively. Of the two sets of four, three opened into the inner court, and one into the outer court, or Court of the Women, on either side. Josephus expressly states that there was no gate on the western side, the wall of which was entire, a fact which, taken with the actual dimensions of the platform, renders it improbable that the *kheḭl* was continued round the west side of the temple. All or most of these nine gates were set in massive towers, 30 cubits deep and at least 20 cubits in breadth, rising above the top of the wall to a total height of over 40 feet (Josephus says 40 cubits, *l.c.* § 203). One other gate, higher and wider than the others, at the top of 15 semicircular steps, led from the outer to the upper and inner court of the sanctuary (H 10).

The way is now open for an examination of one of the most keenly debated questions connected with the topography of the temple, namely, which of the two eastward gates—that giving entrance to the Court of the Women (H 5), or that leading therefore to the inner court (H 10)—is to be identified with 'the door of the temple which is called Beautiful' (Ac 3² R.V., the Beautiful Gate of v.¹⁰)? The traditional view, which is that of most Jewish scholars, supports the latter identification, while most modern Christian scholars advocate the former.

Three points in the controversy may be taken

as settled beyond question. (1) The Beautiful Gate must be the gate named 'the Corinthian' by Josephus (*l.c.* § 204), from its having been made of Corinthian brass, and so excelling in magnificence and value all the other gates, which were merely overlaid with silver and gold (§ 201; cf. II. xvii. 3, vi. v. 3, 'the brazen' gate). (2) The history of the gate called in the Mishna 'the gate of Nicanor' shows that the latter must be identified with Josephus' Corinthian Gate. The ossuary of this 'pious donor' was found the other day at Jerusalem, bearing the inscription: 'The bones of Nicanor the Alexandrian, who made the doors' (*P.E.F.St.* 1903, 125 ff., 326 ff.; cf. 1905, 253 ff.). (3) Both our authorities agree in placing the gate in question on the eastern side of the sanctuary. But, as we have seen, there were, in Josephus' words, 'of necessity two gates in the east' (*J.W.* v. v. 2, § 198), one in a line with and 15 steps higher than the other. Which, now, of these two is entitled to the threefold name?

The principal passage of the Mishna (*M.M.* i. 4) undoubtedly makes the Gate of Nicanor the eastern gate of the inner court, the same that is elsewhere (*Succa*, v. 4) termed 'the upper gate,' from its elevated position. But other passages of the Mishna, such as *Sota* i. 5, *Negaim* xiv. 8, which speak of certain rites of purification taking place at the Gate of Nicanor, compel us to look for it at the outer entrance to the sanctuary. And this is the clear witness of Josephus, himself a priest and familiar with the disposition of the temple courts and gates. In *J.W.* v. v. 3, § 204, in particular, *the Corinthian Gate is placed at the entrance to the Court of the Women*, and is said to be in a line with the larger gate at the higher entrance to the inner court. The Beautiful Gate was, indeed, the principal entrance to the temple in virtue of its position facing the altar and the porch.

The question has been so fully and finally discussed by Schürer in his essay on the subject in the *Zeitsch. f. die neutest. Wissenschaft*, vii. (1906) 51-68, that there should no longer be any dubiety as to the position of the Beautiful Gate. On one

minor point, however, this eminent authority seems to have gone astray. Josephus describes his Corinthian, our Beautiful Gate as ἡ ἐξῶθεν τοῦ νεώ, 'the gate outwith the sanctuary.' To this reading Schürer long ago took exception, and in his recent article he again characterizes the reading as giving 'absolutely no sense.' The form νεώ he further rejects on the ground that Josephus in the *Bellum Judaicum* regularly uses the form ναός (*Z.N.T.W.* vii. 55), and for τοῦ νεώ Schürer would now read τῶν ἐν ἔφ. To this it is enough to reply (1) that Josephus does elsewhere in his *War* use the form νεώ, as in v. i. 2, § 7, as well as in the *Antiquities*; (2) the phrase 'outwith the sanctuary' exactly describes the situation of the Beautiful Gate, since it formed the entrance to the tower erected by Herod over 'the eastern gate' (*J.A.* xv. xi. 7), which must have projected some distance beyond the wall in order to command the curtain of the wall on either side of the gate. Indeed, the statement of Maimonides (*B.B.* vi. 1) that one ascended by twelve steps to the Court of the Women is best explained by supposing that the eastern gate-tower was built across the *khel* as represented on the plan (H 5). (3) The position here suggested for the Beautiful Gate or Gate of Nicanor, on the confines of the sanctuary and the great court, suits not only the passages in *Sota* and *Negaim* above cited, but also the reference to it in *NT* as the rendezvous of the maimed and others who would be refused admission to the temple courts.

VIII. THE POSITION OF THE TEMPLE ON THE PLATFORM.

The last of the problems which it is proposed to discuss on this occasion deals with the precise position of the temple itself within the inner court. The latter had its margin railed off on three sides by a low stone balustrade (*J.W.* v. v. 6, § 225—for the origin of this, see *J.A.* xiii. xiii. 5); this margin, called the Court of Israel, was on a slightly lower level and probably 12 cubits broad (*M.M.* gives 11, and confines it to one side), and to it certain of the laity were admitted. The rest of the inner court was chiefly occupied by the great altar of burnt-offering, the ramp leading up to it on the south, and the place for slaying and preparing the victims on the north. The altar was a square mass of unhewn white-washed stones, 32 cubits (47 feet) in length and breadth,

and 6 cubits in height to the base of the hearth. It thus covered the whole, or almost the whole, of the exposed surface of the sacred rock, the straight western face of which may be taken as representing the line of Herod's altar.¹

Due west of the altar rose the temple itself from a solid stereobate or podium 6 cubits in height (*M.M.* iv. 6), which brought the temple floor to a level with the top of the altar. To enter into a discussion of the conflicting data as to the dimensions of every part of the temple is beyond the intention of this essay. It must suffice to say that the data both of Josephus and of the Mishna require careful sifting in the light of the recognized principles of architectural proportion, as Fergusson long ago discovered. One thing is certain. The ground plan of the *naos* underwent no change from Solomon to Herod. By the latter, however, the breadth of the whole building was increased to 60 cubits (*J.W.* v. v. 4), from what I take to have been the extreme breadth of Solomon's temple, 48 cubits, while the length remained constant at 96 cubits.² The heights are less certain; probably 96 cubits was the height and the breadth of the porch, and 60 the true height of the temple proper without the lateral chambers. The accompanying ground-plan is drawn on these principles of proportion, showing a gradual increase in the widths of the component parts as follows: 20, 32,³ 48, 60, and 96 cubits, with which the data of *M.M.*, as tabulated by Witton Davies, *D.B.* iv. 175, should be compared.

The problem now before us, however, is the determination of the exact spot which the temple occupied upon the platform relative to the altar, whose position is fixed. If we could trust the Mishna, we have only to do as others have done heretofore and measure 22 cubits west from the rock, and 100 more cubits will give us the length of the temple, to which comes a space of 11 cubits behind the 'house of atonement' (*M.M.* v. 1). But to this procedure there are two serious objections. (1) The west wall of the sanctuary—a

¹ The *sakhra* with the altars that stood upon it has recently been the subject of an elaborate investigation by Professor Kittel (*Studien zur hebräischen Archäologie* [1908], with plans, see esp. pp. 17, 81).

² It was Ezekiel, with his love for 50 and its multiples, that first gave the temple of his ideal the dimensions of 100 by 50 cubits.

³ Note that this, the *outside* width of the *naos*, is exactly that of the altar of burnt-offering.

mass of solid masonry rising at least 40 feet above the level of the great court, and $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet (5 cubits) thick—is thrust back to a line 200 feet west of the rock, at which point the hill slopes downwards so rapidly that it would have been necessary to carry the wall up from a depth of 50–60 feet below the Haram level (Watson, in *Pal. Exp. Fund Statement*, 1896, p. 561). (2) The continual recurrence of 11 and twice 11 in the Mishna figures (5 times over in *M.M. l.c.*) awakens suspicion. This number, I am convinced, is a mere inference from the 11 cubits given as the depth of the porch. But the latter was derived by the doctors of the Mishna from the already corrupt Massoretic text of Ezk 40⁴⁹!¹ The nature of the ground therefore compels us to reduce considerably the distance between the altar and the temple, while the principles of proportion suggest 12 cubits, instead of 11 and 22, as the free space on either side of the altar. On the plan, accordingly, the temple is shown 96 cubits long, with a width of 96 cubits for the porch, and of 60 cubits for the main building, standing back 12 cubits from the altar, with a free space of only 6 cubits on the west. And here emerges this result, as startling as it was unexpected! *The centre of the Holy of Holies is now 100 cubits from the centre of the altar and of the sacred rock.* This can scarcely be a pure accident, but must have been designed by those who reared the first temple on this spot.² In other words, the successive temples stood along a line 140 feet (96 cubits) long, extending from a point 41 feet (28 cubits)³ from the centre of the rock to within 14–15 feet of the western edge of the present inner platform of the Haram.

It only remains to present in tabular form the details of the measurements of temple and courts as obtained by a comparison and criticism of the only available sources, viz. the Mishna, Josephus,

¹ The real depth of Herod's as of Solomon's porch was doubtless 10 cubits in the centre, increased to 20 at the 'shoulders' (*J.W.* v. v. 4, §§ 207, 209) or wings as on the plan.

² For those who, with the writer, believe that in P's scheme of the Tabernacle the altar of burnt-offering is intended to occupy the centre of the eastern court (see diagram in Hastings' *D.B.* iv. 657), confirmation of this result is found in the fact that 50 cubits is the distance from the centre of the altar to the centre of the Holy of Holies. The measurements of the Tabernacle, it is well known, are *one-half those of Solomon's Temple.*

³ Made up of 12 cubits of free space plus 16 to the centre of the altar.

the actual rock levels, and the recognized principles of proportion in architecture, and as reproduced in the ground-plan which accompanies these essays.

(1) The average length of the sanctuary from west to east, corresponding practically to the width of the platform of the Dome of the Rock:—

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| (a) Inner court, including B and C | |
| of plan | 170 cubits. ⁴ |
| (b) Outer Court (A), average <i>circa</i> | 120 ⁵ „ |
| (c) Width of the terrace (<i>khel YY</i>) | 10 „ |
| (d) Thickness of west, middle, and | |
| east walls | 15 „ |
| Total | 315 cubits. |

(2) The average width of the sanctuary from south to north, 250 cubits, is made up as follows:—

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| (a) Width of the terrace XX | 10 cubits. |
| (b) Thickness of wall | 5 „ |
| (c) Space between wall and colonnade ⁶ | 30 „ |
| (d) Width of Court of Israel | 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ⁷ „ |
| (e) Width of Court of the Priests | |
| as in Mishna | 135 „ |
| (f)–(i) as d, c, b, a, in all | 57 $\frac{1}{2}$ „ |
| Total | 250 cubits. |

The results set forth in the foregoing essays must be judged as a whole. They represent the first attempt, so far as the writer is aware, to deal critically with the statements of the literary authorities in the light of the evidence supplied

⁴ The following are the details; the figures within brackets are the corresponding cubits of the Mishna: Space behind the temple 6 (11), full length of temple building 96 (100), space between temple and altar 12 (22), width of altar 32 (32), space to east of altar 12 (11), Court of Israel 12 (11)—170 cubits in all as compared with 187 of the Mishna. The imperative reasons for curtailing the space west of the rock have been given above.

⁵ The Mishna gives 135 cubits by 135 as the dimensions of this court. But it has been shown above that the irregular form is due to the necessity for carrying the massive eastern wall along the line of rock. Nevertheless, it will be found that measured along the inner colonnade on the north⁸ side the width is actually 135 cubits, and the same is true of the free space between the colonnades from north to south.

⁶ This item, with the two preceding and the one following, is omitted in the Mishna; but Josephus gives the depth of the gatehouses as 30 cubits, here followed.

⁷ The extra half-cubit is for the stone balustrade which separated the two inner courts (*J.W.* v. v. 6, § 225).

by the survey of the Haram and by the existing remains of the Herodian period. It cannot, therefore, be claimed for them that they are 'compatible with every statement in the authorities,' even had such a claim not been banned by

our greatest living authority, who has recently assured us that 'this is a claim which students of the ancient documents upon Jerusalem will hardly regard as a recommendation' to any theory' (G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, ii. 450).

Recent Foreign Theology.

Helbing's Septuagint Grammar.

WITH the increasing interest that is being taken in the study of the Septuaginta, and the recognition of its bearing upon many problems, not only of the Old Testament, but of the New, an adequate Septuagint Grammar has become an essential for students. A valuable beginning in this direction was made by the important chapter in Dr. Swete's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, and the grammatical details that have been collected and prefixed to Conybeare and Stock's *Selections from the Septuagint* are exceedingly useful. It is gratifying, moreover, to learn that what promises to be a standard work on the subject, by Mr. H. St. J. Thackeray, the translator of Blass, is far advanced towards publication. But meanwhile, for the most systematic discussion of the various questions involved, we have to turn, as so often, to Germany. Unfortunately, so far, Dr. Helbing's *Grammatik*¹ deals only with the question of Accidence, but this is treated with a fulness that leaves little or nothing to be desired. Setting out with the primary object of providing materials for the restoration, as far as possible, of the original Septuagint text, the writer appeals with an extraordinary wealth of illustrative detail to all such late Greek writings as seem likely to throw any light on the orthography of the sacred books. The papyri and inscriptions, in particular, are constantly cited with a knowledge resulting not only from a careful study of the original texts, as published in the large collections, but from a wide acquaintance with the rapidly increasing literature that is growing up around them. And the general result is the complete establishment of the fact that the phonetics and accidence of the Septuagint

'do not go their own way,' but share the general characteristics of their time. It is understood that Dr. Helbing proposes to deal with the more generally attractive question of Syntax in a separate volume.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

The New 'Herzog.'

IN the preface to the first volume of the third edition of the *Realencyklopädie*² the hope was expressed that it would be completed in eighteen volumes. In issuing the twentieth volume the editor, Dr. Hauck, takes the opportunity of explaining why it has been found needful to exceed the limits originally marked out. His intention was to secure space for necessary extensions by shortening some of the biographical and other articles. But, as the work has proceeded, it has become evident that room must be found for new articles, some being necessitated by the development of theological science, and others by the growth of the Christian Church. To the former class belong the new contributions on 'The Constitution of the Early Church,' 'German Idealism,' 'The English Moralists,' etc. To the latter class belong subjects treated either for the first time, or more fully than in the second edition, as, e.g., 'Christian Missions,' 'History of the Evangelical Church in the United States,' 'Dutch Theology,' etc.

Dr. Hauck's decision to enlarge this edition by three volumes will give general satisfaction. Had he not done this, some of the most valuable articles would either have been omitted or have been unduly compressed. Vol. xxi. is to complete this invaluable work of reference. In view of the

¹ *Grammatik der Septuaginta — Laut — und Wortlehre.* Von Dr. Robert Helbing. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1907; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister.

² *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche.* IIIte Auflage. Zwanzigster Band. Toorenbergen — Wamwas. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

difficulties unavoidable in carrying out an undertaking so comprehensive, the editor is to be congratulated on the prospect of finishing the task begun in 1896 during the present year.

An excellent article of twelve pages on the TRINITY is contributed to vol. xx. by Professor Otto Kirn, of Leipzig. Attempts to trace the origin of the Christian doctrine to non-biblical sources are pronounced unsuccessful. This would still be true, it is argued, even if greater resemblances than exist were discernible between the Christian Trinity and the Trimurti of Hinduism or the Babylonian triad. 'The' process which led to the formation of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity does not belong to an unknown, grey antiquity; it was enacted in the full light of history, and its motives are by no means obscure. They arise almost entirely from christological reflexion, and explain quite satisfactorily all that it is possible to explain.'

A concise but comprehensive sketch of the development of the doctrine is given. By the Apostolic Fathers 'the relation of the Father to the Son was not felt to be a problem.' The dominant motive of Athanasius was soteriological; he has no technical expression for the persons of the Trinity, yet his Christology led him to prepare the way for the doctrine of the *ὁμοούσια* of the Spirit, for 'He who is the medium of our communion with the Divine nature must Himself be a sharer of that nature.' Augustine advanced upon Athanasius, whose doctrine of the immanent Trinity stood in the closest connexion with his doctrine of salvation. But Augustine taught that God must be conceived as a threefold personality in His inmost being, even though revelation did not, as it does, oblige us to affirm that the historical Redeemer and the Spirit are divine. '*Trinitas est unus Deus*' (*De Trin.* v. 9).

The Middle Ages contributed nothing to the understanding of the doctrine. The formulæ of Augustine became sometimes the incentive to mystical contemplation, and sometimes the material for dialectical subtleties. At the Reformation Luther laid stress on the religious significance of the doctrine, and expounded it in the light of God's revelation of Himself in historic acts. Melancthon's speculative construction of the Trinity was essentially Augustinian. Dr. Kirn shows that there was a period after the Reformation when the doctrine of the Trinity, owing to

the teaching of Jakob Boehme, was more prominent in the systems of speculative philosophers than it was in the thoughts of pietistic theologians. But, in the writings of Schelling and Hegel, the Trinity has a meaning quite foreign to the Trinity of revelation—it is a key for the unlocking of the cosmological problem.

Of modern theologians Dr. Kirn has closest affinity with J. Chr. K. Hofmann, M. Kähler, and Th. Kaftan. Hofmann taught that the relation of God to man as revealed in the history of redemption must be viewed *sub specie æternitatis*. Kähler, following on Hofmann's lines, infers, from the threefold character of the Divine activity, a corresponding ontological distinction in the Divine life. Kaftan bases Trinitarian doctrine on the historical Christ and on the historical gift of the Spirit; but he differs from those who say that theology is concerned only with the 'economic' Trinity. Dr. Kirn is at one with him in maintaining that the economic and the immanent Trinity are only various, but quite congruous forms of expression for the same fact. 'What the one represents in the form of temporal succession, the other contemplates in timeless relations in God Himself.'

In the last section of his article Dr. Kirn says: 'The *How* of the immanent Trinity of necessity remains a secret hidden from us. No categories of our temporal thought can comprehend the Eternal as such, and no analogies of our experience can attain to the height of the Divine existence.' With good reason he dwells on the difficulty which is due to the fact that in modern usage to speak of three 'persons' means more than the early Church understood by three 'hypostases.' Our word is not so elastic as theirs. Sometimes, indeed, it is so employed as to suggest a *collective* unity, which the Christian doctrine of the Trinity denies.

What seems to Dr. Kirn of chief importance is that the immanent Trinity should not be taught apart from the Trinity of revelation. The doctrine of the Trinity proves its religious value by its explanation of the history of revelation as the self-disclosure of the eternal God. It is a safeguard against Deistic representations of the transcendence of God, inasmuch as it reveals His wisdom and His love not in 'an immanent self-unfolding,' but in the Divine redeeming activity in the world. It is a safeguard against Pantheism on account of its strictly personal, and therefore truly moral, conception of the eternal Will of love.

It is not necessary to agree with Dr. Kim in his estimate of the value of some of the historic words by means of which theologians have attempted to formulate the doctrine of the Trinity, in order to have a grateful appreciation of his able elucidation of the Trinity of revelation. He points out the way by which many perplexed seekers after God may be helped to a clearer view of the Divine nature, who would be repelled by abstract terminology. The immanent Trinity is the ultimate inference of reason as it seeks a foundation in thought for the facts of revelation; theologians have erred when they have held it to be a pre-condition of the understanding of revelation. Not to the Trinity of revelation, but to the immanent Trinity does Melancthon's saying apply: *Mysteria divinitatis rectius adoraverimus quam investigaverimus.*

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

A double *Lieferung* (4-5, bringing the publication down to col. 480 of vol. i.) of the German encyclopædia *Die Religion in Gesch. und Gegenwart* (Mohr, Tübingen) has appeared since our last notice of this work. The most important articles contained in it are: Akademie (by Schiele), Akkommodation (Baumgarten), Akkommodation Jesu (Troeltsch), Alchemie (Strunz), Alexandrin. Theologie (Windisch), Allegorie im A.T. und Judentum (Gunkel), Allegorische Auslegung (Baentsch), Allianz, Evangelische (Kühner), Altar (i. Israelitischer [Gressmann]; ii. Christlicher [Drews and Bürkner]), Altchristliche Kunst (Strzygowski), Altertumswissenschaft (Baentsch), Altkatoliken (Kübel), Altlutheraner (Stephan and Schian), Altruismus (Titius), Ambrosius (Scheel), Amerikanismus (Kübel), Amesha Spenta (Geldner), Amos (Baentsch), Amulette (Abt), Alphabeten (Schiele), Anbetung and Andacht (both by Kähler).

Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics. Volume 1.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS AND OTHER REFERENCES.

By THE REV. JAMES DONALD, M.A., D.D., KEITHALL, ABERDEENSHIRE.

Old Testament.

| GENESIS. | | GENESIS (continued). | | GENESIS (continued). | | EXODUS (continued). | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|--|------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------|
| | PAGE | | PAGE | | PAGE | | PAGE |
| 1 ¹ | 1 ^a | 8 ²¹ | 61 ^a | 35 ²⁰ | 446 ^b | 22 ¹⁶ | 135 ^b |
| 1 ² | 53 ^{a,b} , 309 ^a | 9 ³ | 560 ^a | 38 ¹⁸ | 135 ^b , 136 ^b , 448 ^b | 22 ²⁹ | 390 ^b |
| 1 ⁵ | 316 ^a | 10 ²¹ | 34 ^b | 38 ¹⁸ | 331 ^a | 24 | 556 ^b |
| 1 ²⁶⁻²⁸ | 84 ^b | 12, 20, 26 | 135 ^b | 48 ¹⁹ | 115 ^a | 27, 30 | 353 ^b |
| 1 ²⁹ | 560 ^a | 15 ³ | 445 ^b | 48 ¹⁹ | 483 ^a | 28 ⁴¹ | 553 ^a |
| 2 | 329 ^b , 330 ^a | 15 ⁸ | 310 ^a | 49 ^{4, 22-26} | 115 ^a | 30 ¹² | 478 ^a |
| 2 ^{4-4²⁶} | 84 ^b | 15 ¹³ | 203 ^a | 49 ¹¹ | 330 ^a | 30 ²⁶ | 556 ^b |
| 2 ^{7, 16, 21, 22, 25} | 559 ^b | 17 ¹⁴ | 387 ^a | | | 31 ¹⁴ | 387 ^a |
| 2 ⁸ | 203 ^a | 17 ²⁸ | 669 ^b | | | 32 ⁴ | 507 ^a |
| 2 ²² | 310 ^a | 18 ² | 117 ^a | | | 32 ⁹⁻¹⁴ | 478 ^b |
| 3 | 85 ^a , 317 ^a | 18 ²³⁻³³ | 478 ^b | | | 33 ¹⁸ | 448 ^a |
| 3 ⁷ | 447 ^a | 19 ¹ | 117 ^a | | | 34 ⁸ | 119 ^a |
| 3 ^{7, 17-19, 21} | 559 ^b | 19 ⁷ | 135 ^b | | | 40 ¹⁰ | 556 ^b |
| 3 ¹⁶ | 53 ^a | 19 ³⁸ | 387 ^a , 389 ^a , 391 ^a | | | | |
| 3 ¹⁷ | 587 ^a | 21 ¹⁵ | 5 ^a | | | | |
| 3 ^{19, 22-24} | 560 ^a | 22 | 390 ^b , 391 ^a | | | | |
| 4 | 559 ^b , 560 ^a | 22 ¹⁷ | 483 ^a | | | | |
| 4 ^{14, 16} | 85 ^a | 23 ³ | 446 ^b | | | | |
| 4 ¹⁸⁻²⁴ | 85 ^b | 24 ^{26, 48} | 119 ^a | | | | |
| 4 ²⁵ | 560 ^a | 24 ⁶⁰ | 483 ^a | | | | |
| 5 ¹⁻⁵ | 84 ^b , 85 ^b | 27 ³⁶ | 311 ^b | | | | |
| 5 ⁵ | 204 ^b | 28 ¹⁷ | 351 ^a | | | | |
| 5 ²⁴ | 204 ^a , 444 ^b | 28 ¹⁸ | 446 ^b , 556 ^b | | | | |
| 6 | 560 ^{a,b} | 29 ¹⁷ | 331 ^a | | | | |
| 6 ¹¹ | 85 ^b | 31 ³⁴ | 445 ^b | | | | |
| 7 ¹¹ | 54 ^a | 34 | 136 ^a | | | | |
| 8 ² | 54 ^a | 35 ⁸ | 446 ^b | | | | |
| 8 ⁷ | 510 ^b | 35 ¹⁴ | 446 ^b , 556 ^b | | | | |

EXODUS.

LEVITICUS.

| LEVITICUS (continued). | | JOSHUA (continued). | | 2 SAMUEL (continued). | | 2 CHRONICLES (continued). | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | PAGE | | PAGE | | PAGE | | PAGE |
| 19 ^{27, 28} | 448 ^a | 10 ²⁴ | 118 ^b | 11 ³ | 387 ^b , 388 ^b | 16 ¹⁴ | 446 ^b |
| 20 ¹⁰ | 130 ^b | 13 ²⁵ | 389 ^a | 12 ^{30, 31} | 389 ^b , 390 ^a | 20 | 389 ^b |
| 21 ¹⁻⁴ | 387 ^a , 449 ^a | 22 ²² | 623 ^a | 14 ²² | 116 ^b | 20 ¹⁸ | 119 ^a |
| 21 ^{7, 14} | 136 ^a | | | 15 ³⁰ | 447 ^b , 448 ^a | 29 ¹⁹ | 623 ^a |
| 23 ²⁹ | 387 ^a | JUDGES. | | 18 ¹⁸ | 448 ^b | 33 ⁶ | 391 ^a |
| 25 ^{2, 8} | 204 ^b | 11 ¹²⁻²⁸ | 391 ^a | 19 ⁴ | 448 ^a | | |
| 26 ¹² | 589 ^a | 11 ²⁶ | 203 ^a | 23 ²⁰ | 351 ^a | EZRA. | |
| 26 ¹⁴⁻⁴⁵ | 478 ^a | 11 ³³ | 389 ^a | | | 2 ⁶⁹ | 24 ^b |
| NUMBERS. | | 13 ²⁰ | 117 ^a | I KINGS. | | 9 ¹ | 385 ^b , 389 ^b |
| 1 ⁵³ | 478 ^a | 14 ⁸ | 504 ^b | 1 ³⁴ | 556 ^b | 9 ³ | 118 ^b |
| 5 ¹¹⁻³¹ | 130 ^b , 136 ^b | 17 ⁴ | 792 ^a | 6 | 353 ^b | NEHEMIAH. | |
| 6 ¹⁸ | 447 ^b | 17 ⁵ | 443 ^b | 6 ¹ | 203 ^b | | |
| 9 ¹³ | 387 ^a | 18 ^{17, 19} | 443 ^b | 6 ²² | 353 ^b | 2 ¹⁰ | 391 ^b |
| 10 ^{35, 36} | 791 ^a | 19 ²³ | 135 ^b | 7 ⁴⁸ | 353 ^b | 2 ¹⁹ | 389 ^b |
| 14 ⁴⁴ | 792 ^a | RUTH. | | 8 ²² | 119 ^a | 10 ³¹ | 385 ^b |
| 15 ²⁰ | 387 ^a | 2 ^{8, 9, 22} | 136 ^a | 8 ²⁷ | 117 ^b | 13 ¹ | 389 ^b |
| 18 ⁵ | 478 ^a | 2 ¹⁰ | 116 ^b | 8 ⁴⁴ | 793 ^b | ESTHER. | |
| 19 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶ | 449 ^{a, b} | 3 ³ | 557 ^b | 8 ⁵⁴ | 118 ^b | | |
| 21 ⁶ | 312 ^a | 4 ⁵ | 448 ^b | 8 ⁶⁴ | 353 ^b | 2 ^{7, 15} | 115 ^a |
| 21 ^{8, 9} | 792 ^a | I SAMUEL. | | 11 ^{1, 5} | 389 ^b | 2 ¹⁵ | 388 ^a |
| 21 ⁹ | 526 ^b | 14 ⁵ | 351 ^a | 11 ⁷ | 390 ^{a, b} | 3 ² | 116 ^b |
| 21 ²⁴ | 389 ^a | 26 ¹ | 446 ^a | 11 ²⁰ | 115 ^a | 6 ¹² | 448 ^a |
| 21 ²⁹ | 793 ^b | 21 ¹³⁻¹⁶ | 351 ^a | 11 ⁴³ | 388 ^b | 8 ³ | 118 ^b |
| 22-24 | 671 ^a | 3 ³ | 791 ^a | 14 ²¹ | 391 ^b | 9 ⁶ | 448 ^b |
| 22 ⁵ | 389 ^a , 391 ^b | 48 ^{8, 11, 17} | 791 ^a | 18 ²⁸ | 390 ^b | 9 ²⁹ | 388 ^a |
| 22 ³¹ | 117 ^a , 119 ^a | 5 ² | 514 ^b | 18 ³² | 350 ^b | JOB. | |
| 24 ^{8, 9} | 483 ^a | 6 ^{3, 14} | 791 ^a | 18 ³⁵ | 117 ^a | | |
| 25 ¹⁰⁻¹³ | 478 ^b | 67 | 793 ^a | 19 ¹³ | 448 ^a | 1 ¹ | 330 ^b , 585 ^a |
| 34 ²⁸ | 391 ^b | 61 ⁹ | 478 ^a | 19 ¹⁸ | 117 ^a | 7 ¹² | 54 ^a |
| DEUTERONOMY. | | 10 ¹ | 556 ^b | 20 ^{31, 32} | 447 ^b | 14 ^{21, 22} | 447 ^b |
| 2 ^{9, 19, 20, 37} | 389 ^a | 11 ¹ | 389 ^a | 21 ¹³ | 623 ^a | 16 ²⁰ | 139 ^b |
| 3 ¹¹ | 389 ^a , 392 ^a | 12 ²² | 3 ^a | 2 KINGS. | | 26 ¹² | 54 ^a |
| 4 ¹⁹ | 116 ^b | 13 ¹² | 117 ^a | 2 ¹¹ | 445 ^a | 31 ¹¹ | 135 ^b |
| 4 ²⁴ | 203 ^a | 14 ^{33, 34} | 351 ^b | 3 ²⁷ | 391 ^a | 31 ^{26, 27} | 117 ^a , 119 ^a |
| 4 ³² | 478 ^a | 15 ²² | 61 ^b | 4 ³⁷ | 118 ^b | 31 ³³ | 84 ^b |
| 5 | 791 ^b | 15 ²⁹ | 477 ^b | 5 ¹⁸ | 117 ^a | 33 ²³ | 139 ^b |
| 5 ⁹ | 478 ^a | 16 ^{13, 14} | 556 ^b | 5 ²⁷ | 53 ^a | 38 ^{8, 16} | 54 ^a |
| 6 ⁴ | 274 ^b | 17 ¹⁴ | 672 ^b | 8 ¹⁸ | 512 ^a | 41 ²³ | 54 ^a |
| 7 ¹ | 65 ^b | 19 | 443 ^b | 11 ¹² | 556 ^b | PSALMS. | |
| 8 ⁷ | 54 ^a | 19 ¹³ | 792 ^b | 16 ³ | 390 ^b | 2, 8, 45, 110 | 586 ^a |
| 10 ¹ | 791 ^{a, b} | 19 ^{13, 16} | 445 ^a | 16 ^{10, 11} | 350 ^b , 352 ^a , 353 ^b | 2 ¹ | 478 ^a |
| 11 ¹⁸ | 448 ^a | 19 ²⁴ | 447 ^a | 16 ^{14, 15} | 353 ^b | 2 ⁷ | 634 ^b |
| 12 ^{16, 23} | 351 ^b | 20 ²⁹ | 446 ^b | 17 ¹⁶ | 117 ^a | 5 ² | 390 ^a |
| 12 ³¹ | 391 ^a , 478 ^a | 25 ²³ | 116 ^b | 17 ³¹ | 391 ^a | 5 ³ | 478 ^a |
| 13 ⁶⁻¹¹ | 623 ^a | 25 ²⁴ | 118 ^b | 18 ⁴ | 792 ^a | 6 ³ | 546 ^b |
| 14 ¹ | 447 ^b , 448 ^a | 28 ⁷⁻¹⁴ | 449 ^b | 21 ³ | 117 ^a | 8 | 117 ^b |
| 15 ¹²⁻¹⁸ | 445 ^b | 28 ¹³ | 444 ^b | 23 ¹⁰ | 390 ^{a, b} | 9-10 | 75 ^a |
| 17 ³ | 116 ^b | 28 ²⁰ | 117 ^a | 23 ¹⁸ | 389 ^b , 390 ^b | 11 ⁵ | 478 ^a |
| 18 ^{9, 10} | 391 ^a | 30 ⁷ | 671 ^a | 23 ²⁴ | 445 ^b | 15 ⁵ | 411 ^b |
| 18 ¹⁵ | 204 ^a | 2 SAMUEL. | | 23 ³⁰ | 556 ^b | 21 ⁴ | 204 ^b |
| 21 ¹⁵⁻¹⁷ | 329 ^b | 1 ¹⁷ | 448 ^b | 24 ² | 389 ^b | 22 ¹ | 3 ^a |
| 22 ^{13-21, 22, 28} | 136 ^a | 1 ²¹ | 53 ^a | 24 ¹⁴ | 385 ^b | 23 ⁵ | 557 ^a |
| 22 ²³ | 130 ^b | 2 ⁴ | 556 ^b | I CHRONICLES. | | 24 ² | 54 ^a |
| 23 ¹⁹ | 411 ^b | 3 ³³ | 448 ^b | 3 ⁵ | 388 ^a | 25 | 75 ^a |
| 25 ⁵⁻¹⁰ | 448 ^b | 3 ³⁵ | 175 ^a | 5 ^{1, 2} | 115 ^a | 29 | 117 ^b |
| 26 ¹⁴ | 446 ^a | 5 ³ | 556 ^b | 19 ⁴ | 447 ^b | 34 | 75 ^a |
| 28 ¹ | 483 ^a | 5 ²¹ | 793 ^b | 2 CHRONICLES. | | 34 ¹² | 203 ^a |
| 32 ⁷⁻⁹ | 483 ^a | 6 ^{3, 13} | 793 ^a | 4 ¹ | 353 ^b | 37 | 75 ^a |
| 32 ⁸ | 84 ^b | 6 ⁴⁻⁸ | 478 ^a | 6 ¹³ | 118 ^b | 51 | 49 ^a |
| 32 ²² | 477 ^b | 7 ² | 791 ^a | 8 ⁴ | 670 ^a | 51 ¹² | 309 ^a |
| 33 ¹⁸ | 54 ^a | 7 ¹⁸ | 118 ^b | 15 ² | 3 ^a | 54 | 330 ^b |
| 34 ⁶ | 445 ^a | 9 ⁶ | 116 ^b | | | 60 ³ | 65 ^b |
| JOSHUA. | | 10 ⁴ | 447 ^b | | | 71 ²⁰ | 54 ^a |
| 5 ¹⁵ | 447 ^b | 11 ¹ | 389 ^a | | | 74 ^{1, 20} | 3 ^a |
| 7 ⁶ | 118 ^b | | | | | 74 ¹⁸ | 478 ^a |

| PSALMS (continued). | PAGE | PSALMS (continued). | PAGE | CANTICLES. | PAGE | ISAIAH (continued). | PAGE |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| 77 ⁷ | 3 ^a | 107 ²⁴ | 54 ^a | 1 ¹ | 330 ^{a,b} , 331 ^a , 585 ^a | 45 ²¹ | 559 ^a |
| 77 ¹⁶ | 54 ^a | 110 ¹ | 118 ^b | | | 45 ²³ | 119 ^a |
| 78 ²¹ | 477 ^b | 111, 112 | 75 ^a | | ISAIAH. | 48 ⁹⁻¹¹ | 478 ^b |
| 78 ^{38, 39} | 478 ^b | 118 ²⁷ | 353 ^b | | | 48 ¹² | 1 ^a , 2 ^a |
| 78 ⁵⁸ | 478 ^a | 118 ²⁸ | 65 ^b | | | 49 ¹⁴ | 3 ^a |
| 80 ¹ | 637 ^a | 119 | 75 ^a | 1 ⁶ | 557 ^a | 49 ^{19, 20} | 483 ^a |
| 82 ¹ | 71 ^b | 130 ³ | 478 ^b | 11 ¹ | 61 ^b | 50 ² | 54 ^a |
| 82 ⁶ | 444 ^b | 135 ⁶ | 54 ^a | 11 ⁵ | 119 ^a | 51 ¹⁰ | 54 ^a |
| 83 ⁷ | 389 ^b , 391 ^b | 139 | 117 ^b | 6 | 118 ^a , 445 ^a | 52 ⁷ | 203 ^b |
| 84 ¹ | 386 ^b | 139 ⁸ | 446 ^a | 61 | 390 ^a | 53 | 478 ^b |
| 84 ³ | 528 ^b | 142 ⁴ | 65 ^b | 65 | 49 ^a , 390 ^a | 54 ³ | 483 ^a |
| 84 ⁹ | 557 ^a | 143 ¹² | 577 ^b | 81 ⁹ | 444 ^b , 449 ^b , 466 ^a | 55 ⁸ | 577 ^b |
| 88 ¹⁶ | 477 ^b | 145 | 75 ^a | 9 ⁶ | 330 ^a | 57 ⁵ | 391 ^a |
| 89 ²⁰ | 553 ^a | 145 ¹¹ | 203 ^b | 10 ⁵ | 478 ^a | 57 ⁹ | 390 ^a |
| 89 ^{38, 51} | 557 ^a | 148 ⁷ | 54 ^a | 11 ⁴ | 579 ^a | 57 ¹⁵ | 117 ^b |
| 90 ⁴ | 203 ^a | | | 12 ¹ | 478 ^a , 481 ^a | 58 ⁵ | 447 ^a |
| 90 ^{7, 9, 11} | 477 ^b | PROVERES. | | 15 ² | 447 ^b | 61 ³ | 65 ^b |
| 90 ¹⁰ | 181 ^b | 3 ²⁰ | 54 ^a | 20 ² | 447 ^a | 61 ⁸ | 478 ^a |
| 92 ¹⁰ | 557 ^a | 63 ² | 136 ^b | 24 ¹⁵ | 483 ^a | 63 ¹⁶ | 445 ^a |
| 93 | 117 ^b | 87 | 653 ^b | 24 ²³ | 203 ^b | 65 ⁴ | 447 ^a , 449 ^b , 461 ^a |
| 94 ⁴ | 3 ^a | 824, 29 | 54 ^a | 26 ^{19, 20} | 204 ^a | 65 ⁸ | 478 ^b |
| 95-100 | 117 ^b | 91 | 588 ^a | 29 ^{1, 27} | 351 ^a , 437 ^b | 65 ¹⁷ | 204 ^b |
| 95 ² | 71 ^b | 15 ¹¹ | 54 ^b | 30 ¹ | 623 ^a | | |
| 95 ⁶ | 118 ^b | 17 ¹⁰ | 101 ^a | 30 ³³ | 390 ^a | | |
| 97 ⁹ | 71 ^b | 27 ²⁰ | 54 ^b | 32 ¹¹ | 447 ^a | | |
| 101 ¹ | 65 ^b | 30 ¹⁵ | 644 ^a | 37 ¹⁹ | 116 ^a | | |
| 104 ⁶⁻⁹ | 54 ^a | 31 ¹⁰⁻³¹ | 75 ^{a,b} | 40 ³ | 634 ^b | | |
| 105 ¹⁵ | 556 ^b , 557 ^a | | | 41 ⁴ | 1 ^a | | |
| 106 ⁹ | 54 ^a | ECCLESIASTES. | | 42 ¹ | 634 ^b | | |
| 106 ²⁰ | 116 ^a | | | 43 ²⁵ | 393 ^b | | |
| 106 ²⁸ | 446 ^b | | | 44 ⁶ | 1 ^a , 2 ^a | | |
| 106 ³⁸ | 391 ^a | | | 44 ^{28-45⁴} | 70 ^b | | |

Contributions and Comments.

The Forty Wrestlers of Sebaste.¹

THERE were forty men of a Roman band,
That was set for a guard in the Gallic² land,
Who vowed they would offer no worship nor prayer,
Save to Him whom the Nazarene Maiden bare.

Forty wrestlers for Christ's renown,
Who looked to His hand for the Victor's crown.

'Come forth, all my men!' the Centurion cries,
'Here is Cæsar's statue before your eyes.
A hundred times must the cup be filled,
And its wine at the Cæsar's feet be spilled.'

But forty wrestlers for Christ's renown
Look up to His hand for the Victor's crown.

'Ho! is there a fool who neglects to pour?
For him is determined a torment sore;
He shall stand in the midst of yon frozen lake,
And of food he shall never more partake.'

But forty wrestlers for Christ's renown
Look up to His hand for the Victor's crown.

There is one—there are two—there are three times ten—

There are now no fewer than forty men;
While hand in hand they march in the snow,
Their voices resound as they onward go,
'Forty wrestlers for Thee, O Christ!

Who would share in Thy Cross and will keep their tryst.'

Their comrades have kindled a fire as they wait,
To lure them away from a dreadful fate;
And after some hours one slips from the rank,
And nearly dies as he crawls to the bank.

Nine-and-thirty stand for the Christ,
Who would share in His Cross and keep their tryst.

A clanging of arms is heard from the shore,
For Conscience is claiming a victim more;
A Hero has filled up the gap in the line,
The Centurion stands with the Thirty-nine:
And forty Martyrs for Christ's renown
Receive from His hand the Victor's crown.

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

¹ This incident was told in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for January as an illustration of the Great Text.

² That is, Gallo-Grecia.

The Three Tabernacles.

WHEN the disciples of Jesus saw that their Master was in conversation with Moses and Elijah, Peter said to Jesus, 'If thou wilt, I will [v.r. let us] make here three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah' (Mt 17⁴, Mk 9⁵, Lk 9³³). In his note on the first passage in the 'International Critical Commentary' (p. 184), Mr. W. C. Allen suggests that 'the idea apparently is that of prolonging the scene.' Similarly Dr. A. Plummer on the Luke passage (same series, p. 252) explains that Peter's 'first impulse is to prevent Moses and Elijah from going away.' This does not, however, account for the three booths. Would not one large erection have been better as a place for the intercourse of the three? It is possible that we have here a reference to the tent or canopy erected for a distinguished visitor in order to show him respect. It was the custom with the ancient Arabians to erect a separate Rubbâ (tent) of honour for every distinguished visitor to the camp (Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, i. 255, 1). The Jewish material representing the same idea is collected in the *Monatsschrift f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judentums* (1905), xlix. 18.

A. BÜCHLER.

Jews' College, London.

The Ears of Corn.

THE reply of Jesus (Mt 12⁶), 'But I say unto you, that one greater than the temple is here,' is only intelligible when it is realized that Jesus Himself partook of the ears plucked on the Sabbath by His disciples. It is true that the narrative does not indicate this, but the whole trend of Jesus' argument points to it. For the quotation of the precedent of David turns on the fact that David as well as those who were with him partook of the shewbread. Wellhausen (p. 59) comments as follows on Matthew: 'The infringement of the Sabbath law as part of the regular Temple service cannot be placed on the same line as the plucking of the ears by the disciples, as this was not done in the service of Jesus. The comparison is dragged in by the hair.' This comment, however, is seen to be without foundation, if my reading of the incident be correct. For the disciples were breaking the

Sabbath law in order to satisfy the hunger of Jesus Himself. Allen (*Matthew*, p. 127) says with reference to Mark's 'The son of man is Lord even of the sabbath' (Mk 2²⁸): 'It is clear that this last statement in the form given by Mark does not very well suit the context. It is the disciples who were blamed, not Christ Himself. Very possibly *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is a mistranslation for *man*.' This explanation is rendered superfluous when we assume that the reproach of the Pharisees was directed not only against the disciples plucking the ears, but much more against Jesus who by eating the corn implied retrospective consent. Read in this way the whole passage becomes natural and intelligible.

A. BÜCHLER.

Jews' College, London.

'Many shall run to and fro' (Dan. xii. 4).

THIS verse is a recognized crux. A.V. and R.V. have, 'But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book even to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased'; the Heb. of the latter half, which alone presents any difficulty, runs thus: *יִשָּׁמְטוּ רַבִּים וְתַרְבִּינָה הָרָעָה*. Bacon's famous interpretation of the words in the *Novum Organum*, as referring to the discovery of the New World, will hardly find many adherents to-day. Driver (*Camb. Bible*) accepts the ordinary translation, suggesting that 'run to and fro' is used metaphorically of diligent study of the book, a use of *שׁוּט* to which no parallel is adduced. He is evidently dissatisfied with the interpretation, and admits that the words are enigmatic. For the concluding clause he is inclined to accept Professor Bevan's emendation *הָרָעָה וְתַרְבִּינָה* ('Evils [or calamities] shall be increased'). This is confirmed by LXX *καὶ πλησθῆ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας* (Th. *πληθυνθῆ ἡ γυνώσις*), and is recognized in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*.

But is it not possible by a further very slight emendation to obtain complete sense, viz., by reading *יִשָּׁמְטוּ* for *יִשָּׁמְטוּ*? *שׁוּט* is a rare word, occurring in Ps 40⁵ *שָׁמְטִי כֶזֶב*, 'those falling away to falsehood'; while the noun *שֵׁט* or *סֵט* occurs in Hos 5², Ps 101⁸, in the sense of 'revolters' or 'deeds that

swerve' (*vide* Oxf. Heb. Lex.). It is true that critics are not satisfied with these passages, and that they have been emended in various ways; but שָׁטָה is fairly common (= 'turn aside'), and there is no doubt of the existence of the root. The Oxf. Heb. Lex. compares NH שָׁטָה, and adds that in Targums שָׁטָה means *to apostatize*. Surely this is the very meaning required? The temptation to apostatize was a special feature in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (cf. Dn 11³², where חָנָה, itself in Syriac a technical term for the same thing, is used), and the 'falling away' in the last times is a standing feature in Apocalyptic literature. The words will then run, 'Seal the book to the time of the end; many shall apostatize, and calamities shall be multiplied.'

Since writing the above I have been informed that the emendation has been suggested, as, indeed, one would expect, by several German commentators whom I have not been able to consult. But, since it is not recognized in the ordinary English commentaries, it may be worth while to invite fresh attention to the suggestion, and to elicit the no doubt excellent reasons which have prevented its being adopted.

C. W. EMMET.

The Sun and the Moon Standing Still.

I AM often asked by thinking men in the army whether or not I believe in the miracle of the sun standing still, and as I want to be absolutely sure that I am correct in my answer and in the translation of Jos 10^{12,13}, I pass on these for criticism by the learned Hebrew scholars who read your most excellent periodical.

As the moon was over Ajalon which is to the west of Bethoron, while the sun was over Gibeon to the east, we may safely conclude that it was nearly full moon when Joshua made his march of something like twelve miles from Gilgal to Gibeon and surprised the enemy (v.⁹), who, being a mixed multitude under five different kings, fled panic-stricken along the road to Bethoron (a village seven or eight miles west of Gibeon).

As the day was about to break, Joshua realized that his army was small in comparison with the enemy's, and that with the morning light the panic-stricken Amorites, being able to differentiate friend from foe, would probably rally, so he cried unto the

Lord for help, and the Lord answered his prayer by sending a great hailstorm which effectually darkened the sky and increased the enemy's panic, so that we are told (v.¹¹) 'they were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword.'

Now, as I take the verb שָׁטָה to mean to *sink*, to *dip*, to *set*, I translate the passage thus: 'Sun, be silent over Gibeon (in the east); and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon (in the west). And the sun was silent, and the moon set, while the nation avenged themselves.'

But if one says to a person 'be silent,' it means do not speak; and surely if the same expression be used to a light, it means do not shine. And as a hailstorm in such a mountainous district would effectually darken the sky and shut out the sun's rays, one can see how the prayer was answered.

Of course it may be argued that this cannot be the proper translation, for our Bible goes on to say: 'Is it not written in the book of Jasher?' etc. But the Book of Jasher has never been included in the Canon of Holy Writ; and as it was not written till several hundred years after the Book of Joshua (2 S 1¹⁸), we can see that this is only a side-note that has been embodied in the text by some ignorant and probably superstitious scribe, and therefore its peculiarly illogical phraseology cannot be accepted as evidence against the actual words of the inspired text.

JOHN C. YOUNG.

Sheikh Othman, Aden.

'The Times of the Gentiles.'

WHILE reading recently in the Book of Tobit (14⁵): καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσιν τὸν οἶκον, οὐχ οἷος ὁ πρότερος, ἕως πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος, it struck me suddenly whether this passage does not explain Lk 21²⁴, ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. Turning to Plummer's Commentary on Luke, I find that he already quotes To 14⁵, with the remark, 'Where the whole passage should be compared with it.' But neither he nor any commentator mentions the thought that struck me, that ἐθνῶν in Luke may be a mistake for αἰώνων. This change is palaeographically quite easy in

AI E
Greek, ΕΘΝΩΝ = ΑΙΩΝΩΝ. We have it, in fact in Rev 15³, where κ* C, etc., have ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν,

αἰώνων; Ἄ^oAPQ, etc., δ β. τῶν ἔθνῶν. We have it, further, in the O.T., where Dt 9²⁶, the Cod. B, etc., have βασιλεὺ τῶν θεῶν; Philo, the Bohairic Version (see Brooke, *J. T. S.* iii. 277), several MSS τῶν ἔθνῶν; Lucian, as edited by Lagarde, τῶν αἰώνων. But it can quite as easily rest on the frequent confusion of עַמִּים 'nations' and עֲלָמִים 'eternities.' To the examples quoted in my *Philologica Sacra*, p. 39 (on account of the variant λαὸς and κόσμος in Ac 2⁴⁷), add Mt 1²¹, Curetonian Syriac; Sir 45⁷ 47⁴; Targ. Psalm 87⁶; Aphraates, p. 277, 34; Clemens Rom., ed. Lagarde, chap. 26 (four times on

one page), etc. etc. Through St. Paul's ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ (Ro 11²⁵), we are accustomed to the 'times of the Gentiles'; but read αἰῶνος or αἰώνων and think of the connexion, and I am sure this reading will appear possible, even probable; certainty cannot be claimed for it.

From my Latin-Greek Concordance of the N.T., I may add the remark that, while ἔθνος is everywhere else rendered by *gens*, *gentilis*, *genus*, it is here (and Ac 2⁵ 10⁴⁵ 22²¹, Rev 5⁹) = *natio*.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

In the Study.

A Suggestion and a Hope.

THE DEANERY,
FARIBAUT, MINNESOTA.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have been a grateful reader of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for a number of years, and a yet more grateful user of the *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. And I have subscribed now to what promises a larger range, at least, of usefulness—the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. The first volume has been frequently in my hands during the last three or four months, and the more I examine it the more amazed and delighted I am at its scope and excellence. I hardly know which to admire the more: the remarkable ingathering of topics, or the insight shown in the choice of writers. The work seems to me to bid fair to become epoch-making in the art of making Dictionaries; just as the Oxford English Dictionary has been epoch-making in its field.

But I am not writing simply to express my pleasure and to discharge a debt of gratitude; I wish to venture to make one suggestion, and to express a hope.

My suggestion—a very minor one—is that such 'Cross-References' as are printed on pp. xv and xvi, should, if possible, be introduced also in alphabetical place in the text of the volumes. There would be a material gain, I am sure, if we did not have to look up our key-word in two places. This holds good particularly of alternative spellings, such as 'Abu Ezra.'

And now as to my hope. I have been greatly

delighted to find place given in the Encyclopædia to articles that bear on what might be called 'applied religion'—the concrete problems which every pastor must handle. Mr. Findlay's article on 'Amusements' is a case in point—an admirable article, though its writer has missed two or three references to literature that are at least as important as anything that he mentions. This article and that on 'Accidents' lead one to believe that my hope may be forestalled. There is great need, it seems to me, for the treatment of social problems, as they confront the religious worker, from the historical standpoint. And we are sadly lacking in guidance. There are scattered hints in this book and that, for example, on the condition of the working-classes, and their relation to the Church in England. But so far as I know, there is no work that attempts to point out how the present alienation of the working-classes from the churches has arisen. This is only one instance of a contemporary and most urgent problem which the leaders of the Church, I am persuaded, must deal with in its causes as well as in its symptoms, if they are to deal with it wisely and successfully. And I long to see such matters handled from this point of view in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

With hearty congratulations on the great achievement of this first volume, and with renewed expression of the obligations and gratitude of a humble reader,—I am, my dear Sir, very sincerely yours,

GEORGE G. BARTLETT.

The New Single-Volume Dictionary.

'Taken all in all,' says *The Christian World*, 'it is a very fine achievement, worthy to stand beside the larger dictionaries of Dr. Hastings, and it is by far the most scholarly yet produced in one volume in English-speaking countries, perhaps it may be said in the world, for even the German *Bibel-Lexikon* edited by Guthe, although handy and very valuable, comes short of the British work in range and fulness of treatment. It must be added that the book is clearly printed, and is provided with four maps and several plans.'

The review in *The Record* (the only other yet to hand) has been written by the Principal of St. Aidan's College. It occupies three and a half columns of that very large-sized newspaper. The reviewer says: 'The work is an exceedingly valuable and comprehensive one. The purpose of the book is obviously to meet the needs of those whose purse is limited, and whose studies do not demand the larger work. The younger clergy, the busy clergy of our big parishes, candidates for ordination, educated Church workers, and laymen generally who take an interest in the careful study of the Bible, will find in it invaluable assistance. It is scarcely saying too much to suggest that no clergyman who does not possess the larger book should be content to do without this, more especially if he happens to be a conservative in matters of criticism.'

The publishers have made the gratifying announcement that before the day of publication six thousand copies (the first impression) were ordered in this country alone.

Forgetting.

To forget is not to remember—that and perhaps a little more. 'Yet did not the chief butler remember Joseph, but forgot him' (Gn 40²³). At any rate there is a separate word for it, in English as in other languages, and it may be treated separately.

I. THE SADNESS OF FORGETTING AND BEING FORGOTTEN. 1. *On Earth*. Job mentions it in the bitter catalogue of his miseries. 'My kinsfolk have failed, and my familiar friends have forgotten me' (Job 19¹⁴). It is part of the irony of life, as viewed by the Preacher, that one generation is forgotten by another (Ec 1¹¹); and that the wise

man is forgotten as readily as the fool (2¹⁶). The latter statement seems in contradiction to Ps 112⁶, 'The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance.' Plumptre is not sure that the Preacher is not calling in question the teaching of the Psalmist intentionally. But the point of view is different. The Psalmist is thinking of recollection as a reward. To be forgotten is to him less a fate common to all than a punishment deliberately inflicted on the wicked (Job 24²⁰). It is such a punishment as that with which Jahweh threatens Ammon: 'Thou shalt be for fuel to the fire; thy blood shall be in the midst of the land; thou shalt be no more remembered' (Ezk 21³²).

2. *In Sheol*. To forget and to be forgotten is the lot of the departed in Sheol. To the pious Israelite this made Sheol not merely undesirable, but the thought of it positively painful. For not only was there no communication between him and those he loved on earth (Job 14^{20, 21}); far more serious than that, there was no communion between him and God. This is the meaning of the intense desire for long life: 'For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in Sheol who shall give thee thanks?' (Ps 6⁵). This gave its sting to the name applied to Sheol, 'the land of forgetfulness' (Ps 88^{5, 12}). It was the expression of a religious need, and through religion the relief came. As Davidson suggests (on Job 14¹³⁻¹⁵, *Camb. Bible*, p. 103), the solution was found by the Psalmist in the simple demand that the land of forgetfulness should be obliterated, and that the believing soul should be taken at once by God to Himself.

II. THE SIN OF FORGETTING. The most ordinary example of forgetting is the Egyptian butler's forgetting of Joseph (Gn 40²³). The sin of it lay not in that the butler had a bad memory, but in that he deliberately forgot; it had become so inconvenient to remember. But the numerous warnings against forgetting, especially against forgetting God, take into account the sin of omitting to remember as well as the sin of forgetting. 'Beware lest thou forget the Lord thy God, in *not keeping* his commandments' (Dt 8¹¹). The deliberate act of to-day becomes the unconscious act of to-morrow. It is for this reason that the Israelites are so often warned against forgetting God, and that so many good reasons are given for not forgetting Him. He is their

Creator (Dt 32¹⁸, Is 51¹⁸). He is their Deliverer (Dt 6¹², Ps 78⁴² 106²¹, Jg 8³⁴). He has done very many wonderful works, and all in their interest (Dt 4⁹, Ps 78^{7. 11} 106^{7. 13}, Neh 9¹⁷). Above all, He has made a covenant with them (Dt 4²³, 2 K 17³⁸, Pr 2¹⁷). This is the offence of the sin of forgetting. To forget the covenant which God has made with His people is to cast God off and take to other gods. It is to refuse the privileges and decline the obligations of the people whom God has chosen for Himself that He may set His name amongst them, and that through them all the families of the earth may be blessed. The covenant involves reciprocal obligation. God will not forget His part of it (Dt 4³¹). If the Israelites forget theirs, God is released, and the prosperity that He has promised will not fall to them. That is why the Psalmist of the 119th Psalm so repeatedly encourages himself in the observance of the law of the Lord (Ps 119^{16. 83. 93. 109. 141. 153. 176}). For the covenant was kept by the Israelites when they kept God's commandments. And not to keep His commandments was to forget Himself and to count themselves worthy of the place and the portion of the heathen (2 K 17³⁸, Dt 8¹⁹, Jg 3⁷, Is 65¹¹, Jer 23²⁷, Hos 2¹³). And what is that portion? 'The wicked shall return to Sheol, even all the nations that forget God' (Ps 9¹⁷).

III. DOES GOD EVER FORGET? 1. It often seems so. It is the standing puzzle of all the Psalmists. They had to brace themselves against it, against the evidence of their senses, as it were, by a continual exercise of faith. It was the age of persecution. But perhaps every age is an age of persecution; there are so many ways of persecuting. The poor were oppressed by the rich; the haughty trampled upon the humble in heart. And it often seemed that God was forgetting His own: 'Wherefore hidest thou thy face, and forgettest our affliction and our oppression?' (Ps 44²⁴); and even persisting in it: 'How long, O Lord, wilt thou forget me for ever?' (Ps 13¹), 'Wherefore dost thou forget us for ever, and forsake us so long time?' (La 5²⁰). But it was a time also of religious life. The faith was in good exercise: 'He forgetteth not the cry of the poor' (Ps 9¹²). God does not forget. His answer to this cry is found in the finest of all the passages that we have to do with in an article on Forgetting: 'Sing, O heavens; and be joyful, O earth; and break forth

into singing, O mountains: for the Lord hath comforted his people, and will have compassion upon his afflicted. But Zion said, Jehovah hath forsaken me, and the Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, these may forget, yet will not I forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me' (Is 49¹³⁻¹⁶).

2. We have already seen that God does not forget His part of the covenant. But now the surprise is that if we keep our part of it He does not say we are unprofitable servants, we have done that which it was our duty to do; He promises a reward (1 Co 15⁵⁸), and in promising the reward He even intimates that He Himself is doing no more than it is His duty to do: 'For God is *not unrighteous* to forget your work' (He 6¹⁰).

3. Yet God does forget. He forgets in order to punish. And can there be punishment more severe? It is the last warning of the prophet: 'Therefore behold I will utterly forget you' (Jer 23³⁹); 'Seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children' (Hos 4⁶).

4. But here also there is a surprise. God can and does forget our sin. This is often repeated; the sinner needs its frequent repetition. But there are two memorable passages: 'I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake; and I will not remember thy sins' (Is 43²⁵); 'For I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more' (Jer 31³⁴). The last passage is twice quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews (8¹² 10¹⁷).

IV. SHOULD WE EVER FORGET? 1. We should forget our sorrows if we can. Jacob was enabled to forget all his toil as he named Joseph's firstborn son Manasseh, that is, *making to forget* (Gn 41⁵¹). And the woman that is in childbirth forgets her pains, as soon as they are over, in the joy of motherhood (Jn 16²¹). But Job could not forget his misery (Job 9²⁷), although Zophar recommended him to do so (11¹⁶), because the occasion of it was not yet removed; God was still hiding His face from him.

2. Should we forget our injuries? There seems to be a difference here between the Old Covenant and the New. The New Covenant says emphatically that if we forgive not (which includes forget

not) we shall not be forgiven. Whereas the Old Covenant said, 'Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way as ye came forth out of Egypt . . . thou shalt not forget' (Dt 25¹⁷⁻¹⁹). But there are three ways of it. The easy-minded forget easily. Esau is an example. The stronger character finds it harder to forget, and needs the commandment. It is the strongest of all that, appreciating the injury, forgives and forgets it. That is the 'strength in weakness' which Browning saw. That is the 'my strength sufficient for thee' of St. Paul.

3. But should we forget ourselves? Should we forget our own past? We would if we could. And sometimes we do forget, like the foolish ostrich in Job's remembered simile (Job 39^{14, 15}). It is better not to forget: 'Remember, forget thou not, how thou provokedst the Lord thy God to wrath in the wilderness' (Dt 9⁷). And yet, when the past is past and new life has begun, we are encouraged to forget the things which are behind that we may stretch forward to the things which are before (Phil 3^{13, 14}). It is even to be pressed upon us, as the first duty of all, that we should not let any recollection of the past prevent us from doing our duty in the present. If the Israelites in remembering Amalek had forgotten to entertain strangers (He 13²), they would have transgressed the commandment. And if we remember instances of ingratitude and forget 'to do good and to communicate,' we shall fall into the same condemnation. Even if the past has been shameful we are encouraged to forget it. 'Thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth' (Is 54⁴). We shall not forget how we provoked the Lord, for that would be to forget the greatest of all His benefits (Ps 103²). But the shame of the past may be forgotten, being overwhelmed by the joy of the present, lost sight of in the hope that maketh not ashamed.

Gn 40²³, 'Yet did not the chief butler remember Joseph, but forgot him.'

Mr. J. M. Gibbon¹ makes this the text of a children's sermon. The best point in it is that the butler would not have forgotten if he had cared to remember.

Dr. A. Smellie² is less interested in the Old

Testament Joseph than in the New, and more interested in himself than in the Egyptian butler. (1) The butler was perhaps absorbed in the affections of home and the duties of business. He valued them the more that he had been for a time deprived of them. But home is at its best, and business at its briskest, when I put my New Testament Joseph first. (2) Perhaps at Pharaoh's court he was afraid to speak of his obligation to a Hebrew slave. Christ is not fashionable in king's courts. (3) Perhaps he felt a kind of awe at the thought of Joseph. His character had always been a reproach to the butler's conscience. It may have been a relief to banish him from thought. (4) Or was it merely that he was unthinking and heedless? He was not so when the fetters lay on him and the dungeon walls shut him in. Base ingratitude—but my emancipation has been more astonishing.

Jer 31³⁴, 'I will remember their sin no more.'

This is part of the New Covenant (Jer 31³¹⁻³⁴). The Old Covenant was, as it were, a tryst between God and man—'This do, and thou shalt live.' But a tryst cannot be kept unless both parties keep it. Now God kept the Old Covenant on His part. But man did not keep it: 'The children of Israel did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, and forgot the Lord their God, and served the Baalim and the Asheroth' (Jg 3⁷; also 1 S 12⁹, Jer 2³², Hos 2¹⁸). So the New Covenant is to adopt a new method. The obligation is not to fall equally on both parties. God is to be a Giver, and man is to be a receiver. Notice the emphasis on the 'I': I will make—I will put—I will forgive. An entirely new beginning is to be made on entirely new conditions. The Law is to be replaced by the Gospel.

But before a new beginning can be made the past must be dealt with. No wise general will go forward leaving an unconquered army behind him. Therefore, although it is placed last, the first step that is to be taken towards realizing the conditions of the New Covenant is the forgiveness and forgetfulness of the past. It is mentioned last, but it is introduced by the word 'for,' showing that it really comes first. Whatever else we may find in the conditions of the New Covenant, we must find this, the free forgiveness on God's part of all the past—and such a forgiveness as amounts

¹ *The Image of God*, 1896, p. 151, and (the same sermon) *The Children's Year*, 1903, p. 74.

² *In the Secret Place*, 1907, p. 107.

to an entire and eternal forgetfulness. Before we enter upon the New Covenant we must hear God's word and believe it: 'Their sin will I remember no more.' The subject is the Forgetfulness of God.

I. *There are some things which God cannot forget.*

1. He cannot forget His promise. If He has made a tryst with any one He cannot forget to keep it. 'He will not fail thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he swore unto them' (Dt 4³¹). 2. Nor can He ever forget those that depend upon Him, either in this life or in the life to come. It may seem sometimes that He is forgetting them. The Psalmists are often troubled with the thought of it, and occasionally even cry out 'How long?' But all these fears were at last laid to rest by Isaiah's emphatic illustration: 'Zion said, Jehovah hath forsaken me, and the Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, these may forget, yet will not I forget thee' (Is 49^{14, 15}). More terrible perhaps was the thought of being laid in the grave and forgotten, the thought of being dismissed to the 'the land of forgetfulness.' Ecclesiastes wrestled with it and failed (Ec 1¹¹ 2¹⁶). Job wrestled with it and overcame (Job 14¹³⁻¹⁵). 3. But not only does God not forget ourselves, He does not forget our work and labour of love (He 6¹⁰). This is perhaps the greatest of all the surprises of the New Covenant. The Old Covenant was, 'This do, and thou shalt live'—a clear bargain, with penalty for not doing. In the New Covenant God Himself works in us and through us, and then rewards us for what we do, even intimating that He would be unrighteous if He did not do so (He 6¹⁰). 'Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord' (1 Co 15⁵⁸).

II. *But there are some things which God can forget.*

1. He forgets those who persist in their unbelief and the evil of their ways. 'Therefore, behold, I will utterly forget you, and I will cast you off' (Jer 23³⁹). 'Seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children' (Hos 4⁶). Now, to be forgotten of God was the sorest punishment that could befall an Israelite. It was the fear of it that gave death its sting. 2. But there is another way in which God forgets

those who are sinning against Him. He forgets to punish them. It is the expression of His long-suffering. It is what St. Paul means when he says, 'The times of this ignorance God winked at' (Ac 17³⁰). He is waiting to be gracious. The Psalmist is surprised at God, and bitterly prays, 'Forget not the voice of thine adversaries' (Ps 74²³). 3. Last of all, and most of all, He forgets our sins. The promise is repeated, more than once, and always emphatically. Take Is 43²⁵, 'I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake; and I will not remember thy sins.' Newman Smyth raises the question, Can God forget our sins? He answers it by showing how. There are three things to take into account—(a) the necessity of forgetfulness. 'Two friends who have been alienated cannot walk together again, if the wronged person is simply willing to forgive; if the wrong which separated them is to remain ever present in the memory of either of them; if one sees it in the other's eye; if, though not a word be said about it, either must be inwardly conscious of it whenever he is in the other's presence. If the wrong done cannot be forgotten as well as forgiven, it will remain as a great gulf fixed between those who once were friends, although they should eat again at the same table, walk the same path together and lie down at last in the same grave' (Newman Smyth, *The Reality of Faith*, p. 128). (b) The difficulty of it. The difficulties that have been suggested are these. Our sin is an organic part of ourselves; our nature carries its scar. It is also a part of the memory of the universe. And then our whole life is written in the thought of the Eternal God; nothing has ever been hidden from Him; it is difficult to think that anything can ever be. (c) Yet God can forget. The method of His forgetting is the Cross. It is this that we express in our theory of the atonement, whatever our theory be.

I. Newman Smyth contends (*The Reality of Faith*, p. 129) that if wrong done is to be forgiven fully, that is, not merely condoned but forgotten, the first movement must be made on the part of the person wronged. A man may no doubt say to another who has wronged him, 'I do not care; you may come back at any time and sit at my table if you please; I will not speak of the offence; I am willing to let it pass.' But though unmentioned the wrong would still be there. It would be as a shadow between them until some-

thing is done to enable them both to forget it. And that something means sacrifice, suffering, humiliation—not, in the first place, on the part of the person who has done the wrong, but on the part of the person wronged. For reconciliation involves self-vindication, that is to say, the recognition of the wrong as wrong. And when self-vindication does not come through retaliation, it comes through sorrow and pain.

Now retaliation may affirm the reality of the wrong done, but it does not win the sinner to repentance. Here lies the essential difference between the Old Covenant and the New. The Old Covenant asserted the rule of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. The New Covenant says to the person wronged, 'If a man smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also.' The Old Covenant punished the transgressor and lost him; in the New Covenant the person wronged undergoes the additional humiliation which is necessary to show the exceeding sinfulness of sin, but he wins the person who has done him wrong.

The question is, How can the Holy One forgive and forget our sin? Heaven's answer is the Cross of Christ.

2. Browning uses a similar argument in 'Saul.' The King of Israel had sinned. The Spirit of the Lord had left him, and an evil spirit tormented him. David had been sent for to play before him. The poem opens at the moment of David's arrival. David himself tells the story.

He tells how he played, first of all—and sang as he played—the simple music of nature: 'The tune all our sheep know, as, one after one, so docile they come to the pen-door till folding be done.' Then he touched his harp to the ordinary incidents of human life: 'the help-tune of our reapers'; 'the last song when the dead man is praised on his journey'; 'the glad chaunt of the marriage'; 'the chorus intoned as the Levites go up to the altar.' Saul did not hear the song of nature; the ordinary incidents of human life did not affect him; the first movement took place when he heard the hymn of the sanctuary. For there is no reconciliation through nature; there is none in the daily events of man's life. The first motion is from God. David did not know that yet. 'The tent shook, for mighty Saul shuddered': it was at 'the chorus intoned as the Levites go up to the altar.' But David did not know and did not follow up his advantage. He sang next of the mere joy

of living; he passed to things of deeper emotion: 'the white locks of thy father'; 'the thin hands of thy mother.' Saul was untouched. Then came the reference to Saul's high place, the kingship, to 'ambition and deeds which surpass it,' to fame. This was Saul's master passion. This was Saul's weakness. David ended with the name 'King Saul.'

Then Saul, who hung propped
By the tent's cross-support in the centre, was struck by
his name.

One long shudder thrilled
All the tent till the very air tingled, then sank and was
stilled
At the king's self left standing before me, released and
aware.

Again David was mistaken. His wish was to rescue Saul from his madness. He had already recovered him partly. It was through the promise of fame. So he pursued that promise. And at first he seemed to be successful. He sang of the fame of the future—the marble monument raised to Israel's first king and greatest. Saul 'slowly resumed his old motions and habitudes kingly.'

He spoke not, but slow
Lifted up the hand slack at his side, till he laid it with
care,
Soft and grave, but in mild settled will, on my brow;
thro' my hair
The large fingers were pushed, and he bent back my
head, with kind power—
All my face back, intent to peruse it, as men do a
flower.
Thus held he me there with his great eyes that scrutinized
mine—
And oh, all my heart how it loved him!

At that moment, and through that love, the truth came upon David. Saul is not to be restored by nature, or by humanity, or by kinship's affection, or even by fame. His restoration must come from God—and it must come through suffering. How did David make the discovery? Through the reading of his own heart. He loved Saul. Did God love him less? In everything else God is greater than man. Is it possible 'a man may o'ertake God's own speed in the one way of love'? David himself not only loves but will suffer for Saul: God will suffer also, He will suffer more—

He who did most shall bear most; the strongest shall
stand the most weak.
'Tis the weakness in strength, that I cry for! my flesh,
that I seek

In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall
be

A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me,
Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever: a Hand like
this hand

Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the
Christ stand!

Swift.

There is a scholar and preacher we know (he is at the same time one of the best scholars and most popular preachers in Scotland) who has slyly steeped himself in the writings of Swift. He will acknowledge in private a large debt to the Dean for thoughts which a generation ignorant of Swift calls original, and still more for words which are always clear as daylight and often biting as hard frost. But Swift may be read openly, and he is worth reading often. Our interest at present is—in which edition?

There are only two editions that enter into the competition—Sir Walter Scott's and Mr. Temple Scott's.

Sir Walter Scott's edition of Swift was published in 1814, in nineteen volumes, at £9, 19s. 6d. It was reviewed by Jeffrey in the *Edinburgh Review* for September 1816. The second edition appeared in 1824, again in nineteen volumes, but at £8, 11s. Lockhart says: 'The additions to this second edition of Sir Walter Scott's edition of Swift were numerous, and the Notes and the Life corrected throughout with considerable care.' All this and more will be found in Lowndes, who adds, that in Monk Mason's *History of the Cathedral of St. Patrick* there is a defence of Swift against the attacks of Sir Walter Scott and the Edinburgh reviewers, a sentence which announces the weakness of Sir Walter Scott's edition. It now comes often into the second-hand market, and is offered in good condition at about £3, 10s.

For just as Sir Walter Scott antiquated the editions of Hawkesworth and Sheridan, so his own edition has been superseded by an edition in twelve volumes at 5s. each, edited by Mr. Temple Scott, and published in 'Bohn's Standard Library' by Messrs. George Bell & Sons. It is a modern edition. The first volume was published in 1897; the last volume was published in the end of 1908. Outwardly it is much more convenient to handle than all the previous editions; inwardly there is no single respect in which it is not superior. It

is better equipped with portraits and facsimiles. It embodies the results of a century's research. And although it is surprising that so few of the men who live by the profession of Letters have given themselves to the study of Swift's writings, a good deal of unprofessional work has been done by John Forster, Henry Craik, Stanley Lane-Poole, and others, but especially by the editor of this edition himself. The last volume, moreover, contains four things, any one of which would have given distinction to the edition. It contains, first, an essay on the portraits, busts, and engravings of Swift, and their artists, with a note on the portraits of Stella, all by the late Sir Frederick Falkner, K.C., Recorder of Dublin. It contains, secondly, an essay on the relations between Swift and Stella, written by the present distinguished occupant of the Deanery of St. Patrick's, the Very Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., D.C.L. Further, it contains a bibliography of the writings of Swift, by Mr. W. Spencer Jackson. And finally, a general index to the twelve volumes, by Miss Constance Jacob.

It is not mere curiosity that makes one pass the portraits and read the relations with Stella. It is a subject of universal literary interest; it is a matter affecting the study of ethics. And then the reputation of the author of the essay is itself a considerable inducement. What is the conclusion that Dr. Bernard comes to? It is that in spite of the fact that Stella signed her last will 'Esther Johnson, *spinster*,' Swift and she were married. The evidence does not amount to demonstration, but it amounts to the highest possible probability. As for the signature, that was part of the compact, for if there was a marriage it was agreed that it should never be avowed.

Criticism and Coincidence.

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have lost no time in translating Harnack's *Acts of the Apostles* (6s.). Now we have a good translation of each of the three epoch-making 'Studies.' The translation does not need to have repeated what has already been said about the original. But there is an amusing footnote to page 247 which deserves more attention than it has received.

Harnack is troubled like other critics we know with the desire to remove from the New Testament everything that looks unlikely. He was working at this exercise one rainy day beside the Walensee,

when he turned and took up the *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins des kanton Glarus*, 27 Heft, 1892. There he read that in 1837 the son of the pastor of Schwanden was drowned when bathing in the Aar, near Aarau, and that in the third decade of the same century the son of another pastor of Schwanden was drowned while bathing in the Aar, near Aarau. And yet Aarau is a long long way from Schwanden.

Transcension.

'I have been much interested lately in the little known Catholic doctrine of Transcension, the *passing over* the stage of repentance by fixation of the thought upon God. This is the most esoteric thing in their mystical theology. It treats sin as a nullity, so soon as *we* cease to regard it as real, by raising our thought above it. It is used in the Catholic Church to remove the obstruction to devotion caused by a too hard and realistic sense of sin, and a too long dwelling on the necessity of repentance as a *preliminary* to an approach to God.'

That is one of the *Thoughts of a Modern Mystic* (Kegan Paul; 3s. 6d. net), to whom we should have felt nearer if he had had more faith in Christ and less in spirit-rapping. The thoughts are edited by W. F. Barrett, Professor of Experimental Physics in the Royal College of Science for Ireland, who laments that he is now left almost alone of the small group of friends who founded the Society for Psychical Research.

The Scapegoat in Assam.

The strides which the study of Religion is making cannot any longer escape the notice of the most unobservant. All the theological publishers are entering the field. It is long since Mr. David Nutt entered it. There is no publisher that has done more for folk-lore and other byways of religious literature. But Mr. Nutt also feels the force of the new interest impelling him to the issue of books more thorough and more beautiful than any that he has issued before. He has just published two volumes, each of which has to do with a single native tribe of Assam, and yet each is a large volume, beautifully printed and almost lavishly illustrated, many of the illustrations being in colour.

The one volume is on *The Meitheids*; it is

written by Mr. T. C. Hodson. The other volume is *The Mikirs*, prepared from papers left by Edward Stack. Sir Charles Lyall has written an Introduction to Mr. Hodson's volume, and it is he that has edited, arranged, and supplemented the papers of the late Mr. Edward Stack. His name is enough. Mr. Hodson is thoroughly equipped. But so conscientious is Sir Charles Lyall that whatever he introduces or edits may be implicitly relied upon.

If there is any man who still thinks that the Christian preacher has nothing to do with the study of other religions, let him use one of these volumes for the opening of the eyes. The Mikirs, says Mr. Stack, use *Arnam* as a common propitiatory form of address to human beings, the phrase being, for a man, *Po-arnam-po*, and for a woman *pe-arnam-pi*, which being interpreted means 'father-god,' 'mother-god.' And then he gives a story in which the king is addressed as *Hemphu Arnam*, that is 'Lord God.' And Mr. Hodson has more astonishing things than that.

For example, he gives an account of the festival called the *Chirouba*. At the *Chirouba* a man is selected from among the people, who is to give his name to the coming year. The choice is made with the utmost solemnity. For the man who is chosen has to bear all the sins of the people throughout the year. 'The appointment of a *chāhiitāba*,' says Mr. Hodson, 'rests on the desire to find a scapegoat to bear the sins of the community, or of the individual Raja. The ceremony takes place at the foot of the holy hill Khabru on the grassy plain, to which the significant name Kaithen-māmbi, the meeting-place of the ghosts, has been given. Thither annually the Raja went in solemn procession to sacrifice a white goat, male without blemish, to the God Khabru whose abode it was, and to leave there fish and an offering of new cloths. But there come times when such ordinary devices as these fail of their purpose, and it is necessary to have recourse to special sin-takers. Generally some criminal is found to take upon himself the guilt of the Raja and Rani, who, clad in fine robes, ascend a staging erected in the bazar, beneath which crouches the sin-taker. The Raja and Rani then bathe in the screened tent on the stage, and the water they use in their ablutions drops over the man below, to whom they give their robes and sins. Clad in new raiment, the Raja and his consort mix among their people

until evening of that day, when they retire into a seclusion which may last for a week, and during which they are said to be *nāmungba*, sacred or *tabu*. Sometimes the transference of sins has been satisfactorily accomplished by the simple device of presenting the royal cloth to a "sintaker."

The Summer School in Oxford.

A Summer School of Theology is to be held in Oxford in September. The object of it, says the Prospectus, is 'that men and women who are interested in the religious problems of the present time may have an opportunity of hearing and meeting with some of those scholars who have made special studies in their own departments of theological work.'

The programme of studies is divided into five parts, and it is a most significant thing that the study of religion occupies two of these parts—the first and the last, the three parts between being the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Church. The Prospectus may be obtained from the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, St. Edmund Hall House, Oxford; or the Rev. G. W. Thatcher, Mansfield College, Oxford.

BOOKS WANTED.

1. *Journal of Theological Studies*, No. 26, April 1908.
2. Sully's *Studies of Childhood*.
3. Steward's *Mediatorial Sovereignty*.
4. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*.
5. Kenyon's *Textual Criticism of the N.T.*
6. Drummond's *Philo-Judæus*.
7. *Life of Dr. Hort*.
8. *Lectures on the History of Preaching*, by Broadus.
9. *The History of Christian Preaching*, by Pattison.
10. *The Reliquary* (Bemrose).
11. *Saintsbury's History of Criticism*, vols. ii. or iii.
12. *Reichel's Canon Law*, vol. ii.

BOOKS OFFERED.

1. Swete's *Septuagint*, 3 vols., 2nd ed., 1895, 10s.
2. *Quarterly Review*, 1867–1877, 6d. each part.
3. Fitchett's *Unrealized Logic of Religion*, 2s. 8d.
4. Dalman's *Words of Jesus*, 5s.
5. Baker's *History of Christian Doctrine*, 6s.
6. Johnston's *Grenfell and the Congo*, 1908 (pub. 30s.), for 20s.
7. Oosterzee's *Christian Dogmatics*, 5s.
8. Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection; Revelation of Risen Lord; Victory of Cross; Gospel of Life, Lessons from Work*.
9. Seeberg's *Fundamental Truths*, 2s. 6d.
10. Sir James Stephen's *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, new ed., complete in one vol., 3s. 6d.
11. Laotze, Gorn Old's *Translation of the Tao-Teh-King* 1905, 6d.

12. *Transactions of the Congress of Religions in Oxford*, 1908, 2 vols., new (pub. 21s. net), for 12s.
13. Routh's *Reliquæ Sacræ*, 5 vols., good copy, 10s.
14. Macgregor's *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, 2nd ed., 1907, 3s.
15. Bunsen's *Hippolytus and His Age*, best ed., 4 vols., 6s.
16. Newman's *Sermons*, best ed., 8 vols., 16s.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. D. M. Henry, Whithorn, to whom a copy of Chadwick's *Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for April must be received by the 1st of March. The text is Rev 1⁵. 6.

The Great Text for May is Rev 1¹⁰—'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' A copy of Clark Murray's *Handbook of Christian Ethics* or of Professor J. Arthur Thomson's *The Bible of Nature* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for June is Rev 1¹⁷. 18—'And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as one dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not; I am the first and the last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades.' A copy of Fairweather's *The Background of the Gospels* or any recent volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Rev 2⁷—'To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God.' A copy of Adeney's *Greek and Eastern Churches* or of Rutherford's *Epistles to Colossæ and Laodicea* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Rev 2¹⁰—'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.' A copy of Jordan's *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought* or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.